Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

International Affairs

FBIS-SOV-91-109-S
Thursday
6 June 1991

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
International Affairs

FBIS-SOV-91-109-S 6 June 1991

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Robert Strauss To Be New U.S. Ambassador *[TASS]* 1
Analysts Expect 'Early' U.S.-USSR Summit *[Moscow International]* 1
Primakov Discusses 'Very Useful' U.S. Visit *[TASS]* 1
Primakov, Shcherbakov Address Business Group *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 2
Scherbakov, Others Continue Visit to U.S. *[INTERFAX]* 2
Fitzwater Cited on Bush, Primakov Meeting *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* 3
Economic Experts Visit Boston To Discuss Crisis *[TASS]* 3
Scherbakov 'Satisfied' With U.S. Visit *[TASS]* 3
Primakov Has Talk With Ambassador Matlock *[IZVESTIYA 25 May]* 4
U.S. Reportedly Sets New Conditions for Aid *[INTERFAX]* 4
Fitzwater on U.S. Desire for Summit With USSR *[TASS]* 4
'Sources' Quoted on U.S.-Soviet Summit Date *[Hamburg DPA]* 5
Positive U.S. Attitude on Soviet Trade Noted *[TASS]* 5
No Date Set for U.S.-Soviet Summit *[TASS]* 5
U.S. Officials Meet Leaseholders Union Head *[INTERFAX]* 5
Control Data Promotes Cooperation With USSR *[TASS]* 6
U.S. Aid Dependent on USSR Policy Changes *[Moscow TV]* 6
Report on Waiver of USSR Trade Restrictions *[TASS]* 6
Commentary Examines Jackson-Vanik Suspension *[Moscow International]* 7
President Bush's Colorado Springs Address Cited *[PRAVDA 31 May]* 7
LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Profiles Dan Quayle *[No 20]* 8
Ladygin Interviewed on Moiseyev Trip to U.S. *[IZVESTIYA 31 May]* 9
Memorandum Signed on Scientific Cooperation *[Moscow TV]* 10
Correspondent on Gates' Nomination *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* 10
U.S. Rebuked for Yugoslav 'Interference' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA]* 12
U.S. Actions Said To Harm Yugoslavia *[IZVESTIYA 27 May]* 13

Northeast Asia

Petrovskiy on Cooperation With Japan *[TASS]* 13
USSR Rehabilitates Japanese 'War Criminal' *[IZVESTIYA 24 May]* 14
Japan on Inviting Gorbachev to G-7 Meeting *[TASS]* 14
Gorbachev Greets Soviet-Japanese Exhibition *[Moscow Radio]* 15
Japan To Assist Defense Industry Conversion *[TASS]* 15
Rogachev Receives Japanese Official *[IZVESTIYA 31 May]* 15
Petrovskiy Urges Arms Curbs at UN Forum *[PRAVDA 28 May]* 15
LDP's Obuchi on Japan-USSR Ties *[Moscow International]* 16
DPRK Decision on UN Shows Growing Realism *[PRAVDA 30 May]* 16
Gorbachev Sends Condolences on Abe's Death *[TASS]* 16
USSR-DPRK Cultural Protocol Signed *[Moscow International]* 17
DPRK Army Political Workers Arrive in Moscow *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 May]* 17
DPRK Army Aide Cited on Soviet Visit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 May]* 18
Official on Easing DPRK-ROK Relations *[Moscow International]* 18
USSR Attends Conference on Northeast Asia *[TASS]* 19
Moscow Forum on Asia-Pacific Issues Ends *[TASS]* 19

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Jakarta Cambodia Meeting Previewed *[IZVESTIYA 31 May]* 19
Commentary Assesses Cambodian Talks in Jakarta *[Moscow International]* 20
Moscow Views Cambodia-Vietnam Rail Link *[Moscow International]* 21
Analyst Views Asia-Pacific Detente Prospects *[Moscow International]* 21
Baker Chides Australia's Evans Over Proposal *[PRAVDA 16 May]* 22
Philippine Military Chief on CPP Legalization *[Moscow International]* 22

Near East & South Asia

Four Villagers Killed in Afghan Border Bombing *[TASS]* 22
Progress Toward Afghan Settlement Emerges *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 May]* 22
Afghan Su-25 Attacks, Drops Bombs Inside Border *[INTERFAX]* 24
Israel's Netanyahu on Soviet Leanings to PLO *[Moscow TV]* 24
TASS Opens Tel Aviv Office *[Jerusalem Radio]* 24
Jewish Organization Notes Emigres' 'Plight' *[IZVESTIYA 18 May]* 24
Soviet Specialists To Combat Kuwaiti Oil Fires *[TASS]* 25
Soviet Miners To Build Subway in Israel *[INTERFAX]* 25
Talks Help Break Down Mideast 'Stereotypes' *[PRAVDA 18 May]* 25
Problems with Emigration to Israel Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 May]* 27
Palestinian Ambassador on Near East Settlement *[IZVESTIYA 31 May]* 29
Commentary on 'Doubt' of Mideast Peace Agreement *[Moscow International]* 29
Deputy Defense Minister Departs for Syria *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 May]* 30
Delegation Meets Syrian Army Chief *[TASS]* 30
Returns To Moscow *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 May]* 30
Azerbaijan-Iran Hydraulic Project Begins *[Moscow International]* 30
Petrovskiy Receives Iranian Official *[TASS]* 30

Sub-Saharan Africa

Assessment of Rise and Fall of Mengistu Regime *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 28 May]* 31
Commentary Views New Regime in Ethiopia *[Moscow International]* 32
More on Churkin Briefing on Ethiopia Situation *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 33
Soviet Citizens Evacuated From Ethiopia *[INTERFAX]* 33
South African Businessmen Seek Contacts *[INTERFAX]* 33
South African Businessmen Seek Contacts in Moscow *[INTERFAX]* 34
Gorbachev Greets New OAU Chair *[TASS]* 34
Soviet Vice President Meets Nigerian Minister *[TASS]* 34
Text of USSR Statement on Angola Settlement *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* 34
Bessmertnykh Interviewed on Angola Settlement *[TASS]* 35
Yanayev Receives Zimbabwean Vice President *[Moscow TV]* 35
Falin Meets Zimbabwe Vice President Nkomo *[PRAVDA 17 May]* 35
Official on Maputo Embassy Staff Disappearances *[IZVESTIYA 31 May]* 35
CPSU Delegation Leaves for Uganda 17 May *[PRAVDA 18 May]* 36

East Europe

Article on Army Measures in Yugoslavia *[IZVESTIYA 9 May]* 36
TASS Reports Pavlov To Visit SFRY *[TASS]* 37
Czech Ambassador Tours Yakut-Sakha ASSR *[INTERFAX]* 37
Deputies Paint Monument to Soviet Servicemen *[Moscow TV]* 37
Military Expert on East-West Military Ties *[BERLINER ZEITUNG 3 Jun]* 38
Paper Reports Honecker USSR Asylum Claim *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Jun]* 39
Troop Withdrawal Rift Shifts Walesa Visit Plans *[Moscow Radio]* 39

West Europe

Austrian Chancellor Meets Gorbachev Adviser *[TASS]* 39
German Environment Minister on Talks With Yazov *[Hamburg DPA]* 40
FRG Sends Radioactivity Monitoring Equipment *[IZVESTIYA 24 May]* 40
Soviet-German Troop Withdrawal Commission Meets *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Jun]* 40
Housing Contract Dispute With FRG Settled *[IZVESTIYA 23 May]* 40
Girenko, Falin Receive FRG Politician Hornhues *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* 41
FRG Minister Urges 'Favorable Terms' in East *[PRAVDA 13 May]* 41
Egon Bahr Meets Soviet German Representatives *[TASS]* 42
Frolov Meets Mitsotakis, CP Leader During Visit *[PRAVDA 17 May]* 42
Warship Completes Visit to Swedish Port *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 May]* 42
Dzasokhov Considers Baltic Leaders 'Fascists' *[Stockholm Radio]* 43
'North-East' Delegate Cited on Economy *[IZVESTIYA 31 May]* 43

United States & Canada

Robert Strauss To Be New U.S. Ambassador

LD0406175791 Moscow TASS in English 1729 GMT 4 Jun 91

[Text] Washington June 4 TASS—U.S. President George Bush today announced the appointment of Robert Strauss, former chairman of the Democratic Party National Committee, as new U.S. ambassador to the USSR. Bush stressed that Strauss was the most suitable man for representing the United States in Moscow in this period of fantastic changes in the Soviet Union.

The candidacy of the new ambassador, proposed by Bush, is to be endorsed by the Senate of the U.S. Congress. Strauss told journalists that he would not answer any questions concerning U.S.-Soviet relations until his candidacy was endorsed by Senators.

Jack Matlock completes his tour of duty as the U.S. ambassador to the USSR this autumn.

Analysts Expect 'Early' U.S.-USSR Summit

LD0406034291 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 3 Jun 91

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] Last Saturday the Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and the United States Secretary of State James Baker settled, in principle, the differences concerning the treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe. Both Moscow and Washington regard their agreement as a breakthrough in bilateral ties. Details from Yuriy Solton:

The two countries argued for half a year. The United States accused the Soviet Union of cheating on the treaty by making part of its stocks of military hardware exempt from its provisions. Soviet military experts argued the transfer of three rifle divisions with their hardware, under the control of the coastal guards, was legitimate, for it was carried out before the treaty was signed.

The drawn-out argument hampered the process of disarmament as a whole and called in question the possibility of a new bilateral summit.

The agreement between the two ministers has finally loosened the knot. Although some analysts, including Soviets, claim that Moscow again agreed to unilateral concessions, in fact both countries met each other's demands half way.

The United States agreed to exclude from the treaty's provisions the 1,701 armored personnel carriers assigned to protect the Soviet strategic missiles.

Compromise appeared to be the only way to find a mutually acceptable solution. Every time the military experts found themselves in a stalemate their country's leaders, including the presidents and foreign ministers, stepped in. The success of their efforts proves the national leaders have developed a good working relationship.

The new agreement has opened up the way to the treaty's ratification and has given a new impetus to the Vienna talks on further reduction of conventional forces in Europe. It has facilitated work on a Soviet-United States agreement on substantial reductions of strategic offensive weapons. President Bush has authorized his experts to move forward as fast as they possibly can on the START treaty and the Soviet negotiating team has undoubtedly received the same orders from President Gorbachev.

Last, but not least, the new Soviet-United States summit, the possibility of which was already doubted, stands a chance to be held, as scheduled last January in Washington. Although this is still a matter of the future and will demand much routine work, the good job Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and James Baker did in Lisbon enables analysts to expect an early Soviet-American summit.

Primakov Discusses 'Very Useful' U.S. Visit

LD0406185991 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 4 Jun 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—"Meetings in the U.S. enabled Americans to get a better idea of what is happening in our country. It seems that Americans began to understand better the situation in which we found ourselves today and our programme to haul the country out of crisis by moving towards a market," said Yevgeniy Primakov, a member of the USSR Security Council.

In today's TASS interview upon the completion of his trip to the U.S., Primakov emphasised that talks held in Washington were "very useful".

"Our anti-crisis programme, which we made known to the U.S. side, includes several important elements (such as) price liberalisation, de-nationalisation, privatisation and openness," Primakov went on.

"At the same time, some stabilisation measures are being implemented in an administrative manner," he said. "Therefore, our viewpoints did not converge completely. Evidently, misunderstanding stemmed from the fact that top U.S. officials did not have a clear picture of realities at work in the USSR."

Primakov noted the role of the group of Soviet and U.S. experts headed by Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, which is currently working in the United States to gear the Soviet anti-crisis programme to western aid. "This group works in close contact with us," Primakov said.

"In Washington," we discussed issues pertaining to the economy. But, certainly, everything is interrelated in our world and in this regard the results of talks held in the

U.S. during the visit of Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the general staff of the USSR Armed Forces, are important. The two countries' foreign ministers also succeeded in moving forward and solving many issues at the just-ended meeting in Lisbon. It is perfectly obvious that all this helps make progress in the economic sphere as well," Primakov said.

"The U.S. leadership, the present administration are aware of the need to move farther in improving and strengthening relations with the USSR. Both President Bush and Secretary of State Baker do a good deal here, considering that this is one of the main ways today to stabilise the situation in the world. Naturally, we agree with them in this," Primakov said.

Primakov, Shcherbakov Address Business Group

PM0506092791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 91 First Edition p 5

[Correspondent V. Linnik report: "Engines of Partnership: Results of the ASTEC Annual Meeting"]

[Text] New York—Americans noticing the fine apartments of many members of our delegation at the 14th annual conference of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council [ASTEC] might well have concluded that our foreign currency balance is not all that bad after all. In any event, not as bad as you would expect from our now chronic lateness in repaying foreign credits.

It is a sign of the times, as they say... "On the whole, despite expectations and the quite justified fears of U.S. business at the state of the Soviet economy, around 400 U.S. businessmen took part in the meeting," V.L. Malkevich, chairman of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry Presidium, told your correspondent. On the Soviet side 170 enterprises from various industrial sectors took part.

Nevertheless, the general background of economic relations between the USSR and the United States cannot be considered satisfactory. Last year the trade volume fell from over $3 billion to $2.7 billion. In this connection the meeting discussed questions that have been on the agenda of Soviet-U.S. relations for 15 years now—the enshrinement in law of Most Favored Nation status. There have been improvements in this area—for example, the Washington administration's readiness to freeze for a second year the Jackson-Vanik and Stevens amendments, which hinder normal Soviet-U.S. economic relations.

"Is it not a case of too little, too late? Is it not paradoxical that we are still waiting for full Most Favored Nation status despite the tremendous changes in our country and the positive changes in Soviet-U.S. relations in the past six years?," asked Ye.M. Primakov, who came to the meeting from talks with President Bush in Washington. The USSR Security Council member acknowledged that there is a problem here.

The characteristic of the present meeting on the Soviet side was the participation for the first time of representatives of the republics and the new economic structures.

One-third of the Soviet side of ASTEC is replaced every year. Twelve of the 35 directors are newly appointed. A Committee on Russian Affairs has been created within the council's framework and is headed by V. Yaroshenko, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic minister of foreign economic relations. In the near future it is planned to open missions representing the committee in San Francisco and Vladivostok. A Management Training Committee has also been created, headed by A.F. Dobrynin, aide to the USSR president.

The audience listened very attentively to the speech of V.I. Shcherbakov, USSR first deputy prime minister, on the results of the just-ended talks with President Bush and Secretary of State Baker. "The conversations with the president were very trusting [doveritelnyy] in character," he said. "Concluding them, G. Bush said that he had expected a very great deal from this meeting and that his hopes had been fully vindicated. We are also satisfied at the position of the President and the administration. The U.S. President said that he fully supports M.S. Gorbachev and his reforms. J. Baker stated in turn that the United States is assuming the role of the engine coordinating Western aid to the USSR.

"We gave an English translation of our anticrisis program to the administration and the U.S. President's advisers for expert analysis," my interlocutor continued. "Their first impression was more positive than negative. In my view, the United States is now receiving quite one-sided information from people opposed to the center about events taking place in the USSR, including information on the actions of the country's top leadership."

There is now a group of Soviet economists headed by G.A. Yavlinskiy working at Harvard University in close contact with a group of U.S. economists headed by G. Allison, V.I. Shcherbakov went on.

In conditions of the liberalization of prices in the USSR, Western aid must surely take the form of goods because the trade deficit that we have could lead to virtually uncontrollable growth in prices. Without a supply of goods, sociopolitical processes in the country could reach danger level, Ye.M. Primakov told me.

Scherbakov, Others Continue Visit to U.S.

OW0506121091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 4 Jun 91

[Text] First Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Scherbakov positively assessed the results of his trip together with academic Evgeniy Primakov and one of the authors of the "500 days" program Grigoriy Yavlinskiy to the U.S. On Tuesday he answered the questions by the Union parliament deputies.

V. Scherbakov noted that the aim of the visit was to inform the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, business circles and the U.S. leadership about the program of pulling the USSR out of the crisis.

V. Scherbakov considers the visit to be very useful, because, as he put it, for the first time ever leaders of those organizations and U.S. top officials received first-hand data about the USSR.

As for Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, he, Scherbakov believes, "is skillfully promoting his cause". Already in 1989-1990 the USSR President twice addressed the leaders of the G-7 countries proposing to hold "7+1" talks on inclusion of the USSR in the IMF and the WB [World Bank]. Yavlinskiy was invited to the USA as a free-lance expert in the Soviet economy. Before accepting this invitation, he had meeting with Primakov who told Yavlinskiy about all steps made toward establishing cooperation with the G-7 countries. Yavlinskiy is not working out a new program. He has clear-cut authorities which he cannot exceed, Scherbakov pointed out.

The USSR would like to get U.S. aid in form of uncredited delivery of goods in order to stabilize its economy. All these questions were discussed in the U.S.A. Scherbakov stressed that the USSR does not want "to receive non-committed credits any more preferring rather to borrow for concrete projects to avoid spending money uselessly."

Fitzwater Cited on Bush, Primakov Meeting

PM0406090191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 91 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "USSR-United States: After the Conversation"]

[Text] Washington, 2 Jun—At a regular briefing in connection with the end of U.S. President George Bush's talks with a Soviet delegation headed by USSR Security Council Member Ye.M. Primakov White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater made the following statement:

A 45-minute meeting was held Friday between the U.S. President and Yevgeniy Primakov. They discussed the Soviet economic reform. The President declared that the Soviet reform proposals have elicited a good response and that he expects their real implementation.

The President and Primakov discussed the entire spectrum of bilateral economic relations, including the suspension of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, the possibility of granting the USSR most-favored-nation status in trade with the United States, proposals in the sphere of power generation, grain credits, and the "G-7" conference. The President pointed out that we have not yet adopted a decision on these questions.

Economic Experts Visit Boston To Discuss Crisis

LD2105120391 Moscow TASS in English 1135 GMT 21 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Klimentov]

[Text] New York May 21 TASS—A team of Soviet experts led by economist Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, an author of the 500-day reform plan, arrived in Boston, Massachusetts, on Monday to discuss a new Soviet crisis plan and Western help for Soviet reforms.

The visit is sponsored by Harvard University.

The new plan to reverse the Soviet crisis and help integrate the Soviet economy into the international economy was drafted under Yavlinskiy's supervision and takes into account changing relations between the centre and republics.

Yavlinskiy now heads the Centre of Economic and Political Research.

The plan envisages 30 billion dollars in annual Western economic aid to the Soviet Union on the condition that Moscow moves to a market economy, according to the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR newspaper.

In addition, it calls for lifting limitations on trade with the Soviet Union, changes in Soviet foreign debt servicing and Soviet membership in the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

The Soviet Union in turn will seek to give more rights to constituent republics, liberalise prices, privatise and demonopolise industries, and open up the economy so that it can be integrated into world economic structures, according to the NEW YORK TIMES newspaper.

Prominent U.S. economists, political scientists and former administration officials will discuss the programme. Among them Professor Jerry Sachs of Harvard University, Sovietologist Graham Ellison, who helped devise the plan, former President George Bush's [as received] adviser on Soviet and East European Affairs Robert Blackwell and leading U.S. economic reform expert Stanley Fisher.

Scherbakov 'Satisfied' With U.S. Visit

LD0306170791 Moscow TASS in English 1514 GMT 3 Jun 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Aleksey Tabachnikov]

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS—"We are satisfied with the results of the visit. They exceeded all our expectations," said Vladimir Shcherbakov, first deputy prime minister of the USSR, on his arrival from the United States. He stayed in the USA as part of the delegation, led by member of the Soviet Security Council Yevgeniy Primakov.

The aim of the visit, Shcherbakov told TASS, was to find "mutually acceptable forms of tailoring Western aid to the Soviet anti-crisis programme, whose elaboration is in the final stages".

During talks with the U.S. President and secretary of state the issue of inviting Mikhail Gorbachev to the July meeting of the group of seven was raised, Shcherbakov said. The U.S. side stressed the need to study closely the real situation in the Soviet economy, to define the forms and amount of the possible aid and then to submit this problem to discussion by the Group of 7.

Shcherbakov added that discussions of this subject led the Soviet delegation to believe that the invitation to the London meeting would be sent to the Soviet leader.

He also said that President George Bush reaffirmed that after a careful study of the Soviet emigration law he would take a decision on "suspending the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, raise the issue of granting Most Favoured Nation status to the Soviet Union, positively examine credits to buy U.S. grain and submit for ratification by the congress a trade agreement between the ussr and the U.S. a programme of large investments by the west into the soviet economy was also discussed. Major progress was attained on these issues, shcherbakov replied.

Another result of the talks, Shcherbakov said, is that the U.S. side has drastically reviewed its assessment of Valentin Pavlov's anti-crisis programme, admitting that the programme marks strong advance towards the market.

Shcherbakov stressed that the programme can be even more radical, but only "on condition of stable aid".

Grigory Yavlinskiy, who also took part in talks with the American leadership, was concerned with how to tailor Western aid to the anti-crisis programme of the Soviet government, he said.

"There is no separate, let alone alternative, programme by Yavlinskiy. The question was not posed in this way," Shcherbakov stressed in conclusion. "he is doing a very important job which, I hope, will be successful".

Primakov Has Talk With Ambassador Matlock

PM0506104191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 May 91 Moscow Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 24 May USSR Security Council Member Ye.M. Primakov received J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request.

Questions of economic cooperation between the USSR and the United States and other developed industrial states were discussed.

U.S. Reportedly Sets New Conditions for Aid

OW0506125991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 4 Jun 91

[By Mikhail Mayorov, diplomatic correspondent; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature]

[Text] According to journalists said to be close to the USSR Foreign Ministry, during last week's Lisbon meeting between Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and James Baker, Washington advanced a set of new conditions for Moscow to get large-scale financial aid. Moscow was urged to slash its military spending, grant independence to the Baltic republics, and end assistance to Cuba.

Neither members of the presidential team nor other Soviet diplomats have so far indicated whether or not the U.S. can be given the guarantees it requests. The absence of official reaction should be attributed to the delicacy of the matter as well as the lack of comprehensive information about progress in the mission which USSR Security Council member Yevgeniy Primakov and prominent economist Grigory Yavlinskiy are currently fulfilling in the United States.

IZVESTIYA's political observer Stanislav Kondrashov has said in a conversation with DP's [Diplomatic Panorama] correspondent that Moscow is interested not so much in the very fact of taking part in the London conference or coming into closer contact with the world's leading industrialized nations, as in getting the West to adopt a program for giving the USSR large-scale assistance, which is only thinkable with Soviet consent to meet the demands advanced by Westerners, specifically for radicalizing economic reform in the Soviet Union. All will depend on how much the USSR actually needs Western help—and we need it badly, Kondrashov said. He added that a lot would depend also on how actively the parallel progress of disarmament progressed. The conventional arms cuts agreed upon at the Baker-Bessmertnykh meeting in Lisbon inspire certain optimism, IZVESTIYA's observer said.

Asked to confirm mediamen's allegations that the West might offer the USSR 100, 150 or even 180 billion dollars in assistance, Mr. Kondrashov observed: "It's too good to be true," thus indicating that Moscow would be satisfied with a smaller sum. According to him, the Soviet Union needs foreign help so badly that the national parliament would be unlikely to turn down an appropriate bill.

Fitzwater on U.S. Desire for Summit With USSR

LD0406082291 Moscow TASS in English 0805 GMT 4 Jun 91

[By correspondent Andrey Fedyashin]

[Text] Washington June 4 TASS—Although a date for a U.S.- Soviet summit meeting has yet to be set, the White House is looking at the end of June or the beginning of

July for scheduling it, White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater told a briefing in the White House on Monday.

He said U.S. President George Bush "wants to have a summit" with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, and that both sides will intensify work to reach important arms control agreements. He added that the administration proceeds from the fact that the meeting will be held in Moscow.

Fitzwater said the administration is holding consultations with the allies on the agreement reducing conventional forces in Europe, and is intensifying its efforts on a strategic arms treaty (START).

"Both sides clearly want to have a summit. We are looking at the end of June or July for scheduling it but we don't have a date at this point. Whether we'd have it this week or not I just can't say," Fitzwater said.

He said the U.S. side would like to have the START pact ready for a Moscow summit, and stressed that both sides are able to do so, adding that the reciprocal desire to reach agreement rather than time is the major factor.

He said that in addition to strategic offensive weapons, the USSR and the United States have other issues to discuss at the summit in Moscow.

'Sources' Quoted on U.S.-Soviet Summit Date

LD0506160191 Hamburg DPA in German 1426 GMT 5 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow (DPA)—According to information possessed by the Russian Information Agency RIA the U.S.-Soviet summit in Moscow will be held from 25 to 27 June. RIA's report today is based on sources close to the Soviet Foreign Ministry, it says. Soviet state and party leader Mikhail Gorbachev wants to discuss possible Western financial assistance before the world economic summit in London in July, it says.

U.S. Government circles were saying today that dates between 24 and 28 June and, what seems more probable, early July are being considered for the summit.

Positive U.S. Attitude on Soviet Trade Noted

LD0406094391 Moscow TASS in English 0906 GMT 4 Jun 91

[By correspondent Aleksey Berezhkov]

[Text] Washington June 4 TASS—The latest public opinion poll taken by THE WASHINGTON POST jointly with the ABC TV network shows that the majority of Americans are in favor of removing trade barriers and expanding Soviet-American trade.

The study shows that 71 percent are in favor of granting most favored nation status to the Soviet Union in trade with the United States. Twenty-two percent are against this. At the same time only one-third of Americans think that the U.S. ought to render economic aid to the Soviet Union in an effort to help revive the Soviet economy.

The poll also showed the Americans' attitude to President Bush's performance. A total of 76 percent of those questioned assessed it positively. This is a little lower than in April when 80 percent rated him positively. Bush's highest popularity coincided with the end of the Gulf war, when 90 percent approved of his record.

No Date Set for U.S.-Soviet Summit

LD0406131391 Moscow TASS in English 1239 GMT 4 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—"The USSR president does not know the exact date of the Soviet-American summit," a presidential spokesman told TASS today, commenting on Western reports that the meeting will be held in Moscow on June 25 and 27.

The sides want to hold the summit as agreed and necessary efforts are being taken to achieve this, he said.

The Soviet Union and the United States reached an agreement on conventional arms and they will now concektrate on strategic offensive weapons, it was said at the recent talks between the Soviet foreign minister and U.S. secretary of state in Lisbon.

In case of progress at the talks, "the holding of a Soviet-American summit this summer is not excluded."

U.S. Officials Meet Leaseholders Union Head

OW2805051491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 27 May 91

[Text] Edward Hewett, a special assistant to the president, Frank Vargo, the deputy assistant secretary of commerce, and Gary Grappo, a representative of the U.S. State Department met on May 25 with the general director of the Executive Directorate of the Union of Leaseholders and Businessmen (Russian acronym SaiP) of the USSR, Mr. Ilya Basking and a group of Soviet businessmen.

The unofficial meeting discussed questions of cooperation between the SAiP and American ministries in connection with giving credit to the emerging Soviet business sector, the creating of joint ventures and teaching Soviet business people in the USA contemporary methods of introducing a market economy.

Edward Hewett emphasised that the $1.5 billion of credit which the American administration is intending to offer the Soviet Union will be dedicated solely to the purchase of grain. He said that in his opinion, from the point of view of establishing a market system in the USSR, the best way forward would be to give credits to concrete (private) enterprises and businessmen. In this context he recommended that the Soviet participators of the meeting enter into more active cooperation with the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development and

promised that the USA (as the biggest share holder in the bank) would look into the possibility of handing out small (a few million dollars) loan to the Soviet private sector.

The American side also expressed the hope that contacts between the new Soviet economic structure and the commercial representative at the American Embassy would be activated.

The American delegation also includes many more specialists in the USSR on the request of George Bush to find out which economic structures would be the best vehicles for economic help. The delegation is also carrying out consultations with representatives of the Soviet administration and business circles.

Control Data Promotes Cooperation With USSR

LD0306121491 Moscow TASS in English 1018 GMT 3 Jun 91

[By correspondent Valdimir Suprun]

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS—"We firmly believe that additional favourable opportunities for mutually advantageous trade with the Soviet Union are lying ahead," president of the Control Data Foundation Lawrence Perelman told TASS upon his arrival here on a brief visit to study prospects for signing contracts to supply the latest computer equipment to the Soviet Union.

Perelman told TASS that with its 20 years of experience in cooperating with the Soviet Union the Control Data Corporation values the positions it has won on the Soviet market and looks for further opportunities to expand its stand there.

He especially stressed the fact that even during the eighties, when contacts between the United States and the USSR in the field of technological trade were virtually at their lowest, Control Data remained the only major American company which maintained technological cooperation with Soviet partners on a legal basis.

Perelman added that the company personnel regarded it as a good sign that President Mikhail Gorbachev visited Control Data headquarters during his last year's visit to the United States.

Control Data optimism at present is based on the recently reached agreement with the Soviet Academy of Sciences on closer cooperation in the use of computer equipment and new developments offered by Control Data in such fields as prospecting for oil and gas in the Soviet Union, raising the level of safety of Soviet nuclear power stations and adapting Control Data production programmes for use in Soviet-made computers.

"I know," the Control Data president told TASS, "that the Soviet Union has huge intellectual and economic potential and possesses immense natural resources. The sooner Soviet-American trade and economic relations are normalized and the Soviet Union is integrated into the world economic order, the more effectively it will be possible to solve the complex problems confronting the country."

Perelman stressed that his company is ready to contribute to the process.

U.S. Aid Dependent on USSR Policy Changes

LD3105201791 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 31 May 91

[Commentary by V. Orlov; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Economic relations between the superpowers is the basic theme of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue going on at the moment. Today George Bush is receiving Yevgeniy Primakov, USSR presidential adviser, in Washington, while in Lisbon U.S. Secretary of State Baker is meeting USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh.

The Americans have stated that as yet they are not prepared to give the USSR major financial help. Supplying aid is made dependent on certain changes in the political course being implemented by Gorbachev, ending military suport to Fidel Castro's communist regime in Cuba, cutting military spending, and halting repressions against the Baltic states. Otherwise the U.S. Congress may block the allocation of aid to the Soviet Union. Apart from that the Bush administration considers that the West should not help the USSR until the Soviets present a realistic economic plan. As yet, in the opinion of the U.S. side, the Soviet Union does not have such a plan.

Baker believes that Gorbachev will lead the country's economy to a market system. However, he considers that the Soviet president has not yet demonstrated the political will to implement his aims. If the Kremlin shows decisiveness in switching to a market economy in deeds in the next few weeks, then aid from the West is practically guaranteed, as is an invitation to Gorbachev to the meeting of the G-7 leaders in July in London.

Report on Waiver of USSR Trade Restrictions

LD0406082891 Moscow TASS in English 0811 GMT 4 Jun 91

[By correspondent Andrey Fedyashin]

[Text] Washington June 4 TASS—U.S. President George Bush on Monday informed the Congress about his decision to waive the Jackson-Vanik Amendment for the Soviet Union for another year.

The amendment, adopted in 1974, required the Soviet Union to allow free emigration for U.S. trade concessions.

The current waiver, granted last December, expired on June 2.

"The President made this decision in view of the fact that the Soviet Government has substantially reduced barriers to emigration for Soviet citizens," White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater said.

The President's decision requires no approval by the U.S. Congress.

The waiver clears the way for 1.5 billion U.S. dollar credits to buy U.S. agricultural products and leads to giving the Soviet Union most-favoured-nation trade benefits.

Commentary Examines Jackson-Vanik Suspension

LD0406151691 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 4 Jun 91

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton]

[Text] On Monday, President Bush informed the Congress of his decision to suspend the Jackson-Vanik amendment in respect to the Soviet Union for another 12 months. The amendment was adopted in 1974. It imposed restrictions on trade with this country and made granting of credits dependent on the freedom of exit from the Soviet Union. Commentary by Yuriy Solton:

In my opinion, writes our commentator, President Bush's decision proves once more that, after a certain decline, the Soviet-American relations have been gaining strength. Following the recent hesitations the White House has apparently believed in the Soviet leader's serious intentions to pursue the line of democratic reforms aimed at building a market economy. An important role has also been played by a meeting of two Gorbachev's envoys, Yevgeniy Primakov and Vladimir Shcherbakov, with George Bush in the United States. The head of the White House said after the meeting that he liked what he had heard and that some decisions were possible. Already one ofthem has been taken. It enables the Washington administration to give the Soviet Union an additional one-and-a-half billion dollars in credits for purchasing farm produce. Besides, the Soviet Union may count on another 600 million dollars in credits for other purposes.

It's a pity the main obstacle on the road to Soviet-American economic cooperation has not yet been removed. The United States is yet to decide on granting the USSR the Most Favored Nation status in trade and credits and so on a new trade agreement with the Soviet Union. The White House press secretary, Marlin Fitzwater, has told reporters President Bush is examining the question and will announce his decision this week, or perhaps later. I would especially emphasize the fact, writes Yuriy Solton, that during the talks with Soviet representatives the American side did not set any preliminary conditions for economic aid to the Soviet Union. According to Yevgeniy Primakov, the American partners understand that the Soviet Union is not the country to speak to in an ultimatum-like language, even after the Persian Gulf's victory.

One more thing: President Bush's decision to prolong the moratorium on the Jackson-Vanik amendment for another 12 months testifies to his firm desire that a Soviet-American summit takes place. The other day the chief obstacles hindering disarmament talks have been cleared away. Both sides are taking steps to work out important trade and economic agreements. All the signs are that the summit may after all be held in moscow at the end of June, or the beginning of July.

President Bush's Colorado Springs Address Cited

PM0406090391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[Report "obtained through TASS channels": "President's Opinion"]

[Text] On 29 May U.S. President Bush spoke at the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs. Concerning Soviet-American relations and disarmament problems in the Near East, he said, in part:

For 40 years my generation struggled within the tight confines of a divided world stuck in the ice of ideological conflict and preoccupied with the idea of the possibility of yet another war in Europe. Recently many people here and abroad have begun to doubt whether America still has the strength and the will to bear the burden of world leadership. Dear fellow Americans, we still have the strength and the will and we will continue to do so.

There is no doubt that the Soviet Union remains our chief opponent. Our two separate systems represent entirely different values. Since then we have witnessed amazing political changes.

But let us not forget that the Soviet Union still has immense military might. In the foreseeable future it will have the largest ground forces in Europe and, in view of probably five new strategic missiles systems that are being developed, the Soviets will be ready for another stage of the modernization of strategic forces by the mid-nineties.

But, at the same time, Soviet forces are on the long way home from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and, fortunately, from a reunited Germany. We hope that the Soviet Union itself will continue to move toward freeedom.

As the polarization of forces and the contradictions between the superpowers ease, military strategists will focus attention on the more unstable regimes that have modern armaments in their arsenals and are consumed by long-standing ambitions.

We are fully resolved to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction, but there is a danger that, despite our efforts, by the end of the century nearly two dozen

developing countries will apparently have ballistic missiles. In many countries programs are already being implemented for the development of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons. But nowhere is the danger of the spread of armaments more urgent than in the Near East.

Having consulted with the governments of this and other regions on how to slow down and then reverse the buildup of unnecessary and destabilizing weapons, I am today putting forward an initiative on arms control in the Near East. It proposes directives for suppliers exporting conventional armaments, barriers to the export of components that are used in mass destruction weapons, the freezing now and subsequent banning of surface-to-surface missiles in that region, and a ban on the production of materials for nuclear weapons. The halting of the spread of conventional and nuclear weapons in the Near East, while supporting every state's legitimate self-defense needs , will require the cooperation and assistance of many states in this and other regions. It will be a difficult matter, but the path to peace has never been easy.

LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Profiles Dan Quayle

91UF0772A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 20, 22 May 91 p 4

[Article by political observer Igor Belyayev: "The Quayle Enigma"]

[Text] **There has been an explosion of world interest in the No. 2 in the United States—Vice President Dan Quayle. Particularly in connection with the fact that at the time of G. Bush's recent illness the question of the temporary transfer of presidential authority to the former arose. As did many questions, including: Is he ready to perform the duties of the head of the administration? Even for a short time? After all, Americans know so little about his professional qualities. In fact, what do we know about him? Practically nothing. But it is essential that we do know him, the more so if it is considered that in the very near future Dan Quayle intends to visit the East European countries. We should not forget something else either—second persons in the United States and in other countries have performed and may perform, by virtue of unfolding circumstances, an important role....**

For the past two years and more Dan Quayle has been in G. Bush's heavy shadow. Particularly at the time of the war in the Persian Gulf region. Now, however, the interesting results of a poll conducted by Gallup in March 1990 have been warily recalled. At that time 54 percent of those polled, including 43 percent of Republicans, had more than unflattering things to say about Dan Quayle. They passed the impartial verdict that he was insufficiently qualified to be president of the United States. Some 49 percent believed that G. Bush (not having exhibited signs of illness at that time) should find himself a new partner for the 1992 election....

Dan Quayle himself reacted to the results of the poll quite calmly:

"My qualities have always been based on personal contacts and a desire for compromise...."

The American journalists who observe him constantly believed that such a self-testimonial was only wishful thinking, nothing more. After all, the present vice president has constantly to fight off opponents showering him with their unduly offensive opinions and caustic comments. Yet Dan Quayle is, for all that, vice president of the United States. Formally No. 2 in the present administration.

When he was elected to the Senate in 1980, many people became lost in conjecture: What played the part of springboard in his jump to Capitol Hill in Washington? The most penetrating of his friends were most likely right in believing that it was his family. Dan Quayle prefers not to expatiate on it. Its connections with the ruling establishment are more than considerable....

Dan Quayle was attending a privileged school in the state of Arizona just when his neighbor, the celebrated Barry Goldwater, was starting his unsuccessful bid for the presidency. All that was happening at that time around the legendary senator and subsequently, when he was head of the Senate Intelligence Committee, became a topic of the most attentive discussion in the Quayle household. The political beliefs of Barry Goldwater, a conservative among conservatives, were professed by all generations in the family of the future vice president. After all, it was with good reason that his appearance on G. Bush's team evoked a sigh of relief from the right....

Dan Quayle is not an extremist, which is to his credit. And no one would venture to accuse the present vice president of unpopular extreme actions. Although, chronologically, at least, he is a contemporary of the "cold war." He was born in 1947. Garry Wills, who wrote about this in TIME magazine, considered it his duty to recall that the CIA emerged simultaneously with him. As also, incidentally, the notorious list of U.S. subversive organizations and the program for consolidating domestic security, which caused a considerable sensation. His father and grandfather did everything for the victory of D. Eisenhower at the 1952 presidential election. But barely had the legendary general taken a step toward cooperation with the Soviet Union before the two supported the John Birch Society, which had appeared in 1958 and was conservative even among conservatives!

It is claimed that Dan Quayle spent his political youth among those for whom devotion to the Birchites was food for the soul. But it was at that time that his propensity for compromise, which has become second nature to him as a politician, made itself known. Over the years it has become predominant, which helped him surprisingly find himself in the White House with President G. Bush in 1989.

In his student years Dan Quayle did not overlook journalism, although his main attachment was, in accordance with family tradition, to politics. Graduating from

law school in Indianapolis, he gained a real opportunity to make his way in big politics. Which is why, in fact, he doggedly took in the subtleties of the law. Contiguity with ideology became an imperative for him. His mental attunement against the left took shape firmly, which helped him in his ascent....

Dan Quayle has given a superlative account of himself in political mountaineering. He would first climb to the next peak and quickly master all the necessary methods allowing him to hold on there. He would then begin to prepare for the next ascent. An ability to choose for oneself a suitable job is an art possessed by far from everyone laying claim to an involvement in politics professionally. Or, indeed, one who aspires to become firmly ensconced in the beckoning corridors of power. Dan Quayle did possess it. Not every American politician, even one made wise by experience, possesses so enviable a quality....

A student at a university in Northern Indiana renowned for its traditions inculcated by the Methodist Church, which is most influential in the United States, he now devoted his whole time only to politics. His family—the generator of all his ideas—believed that opportunities to get among the "big boys" could in fact be in store for him. It was at that time that there appeared the quality which is helping him now—an endeavor, significant to all those with an interest in him, to be in the right place at the right time and to achieve consensus. By no means at any price, but always preserving an opportunity to appear necessary to a sponsor or partner. The all-absorbing pragmatism most likely ensured his appearance on G. Bush's team at the 1988 elections....

Not the least role in his rapid career has been performed by his ability to find a common language even with fellow travelers. Of course, for the sake of compromise in politics, to which Dan Quayle himself is devoted, he is always prepared to opportunely and appropriately switch on his whole arsenal, as yet not fully revealed, of personal charm. It is considerable. And when his own arsenal manifestly comes up short, he is helped out by his wife Marilyn and his children. It was they who were christened Dan Quayle's "rescuers" when he ran for the Senate in 1980.

When many authoritative political observers of what is happening in Washington, "from within," so to speak, attempt to define Dan Quayle's place under President G. Bush, some of them sometimes agree in the assertion that the present vice president is playing in the White House the same part that R. Nixon played under D. Eisenhower. Although there is no comparing their political importance. Nonetheless, there is something to so by no means surprising a comparison. At the same time I would like to emphasize that the times, gentlemen, have changed. There has been an appreciable change in the relations between the United States and Soviet Union. A new world order is gaining momentum....

Some people in the White House consider Dan Quayle the "voice of the right" even. I believe that there are grounds for such a strong opinion, but it fails to take account of the environment in which G. Bush has to operate. Any U.S. president has to pay his dues to the conservatives, if only for effect. Even if he himself is not of the right. And the present vice president is taking account of so important a circumstance not without benefit to himself. Speaking of his attitude toward the Soviet Union, Dan Quayle always emphasizes that his position does not differ from that of the president....

Ladygin Interviewed on Moiseyev Trip to U.S.

PM3105135191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 May 91 Union Edition p 3

[Interview with Lieutenant General F. Ladygin, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Treaty and Legal Directorate, by V. Litovkin; date and place of interview not stated; first two paragraphs are introduction: "How Our Generals' Visit to Washington Ended"]

[Text] A Soviet delegation headed by Army General M. Moiseyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, was in Washington 20 through 22 May 1991. The delegation included USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yu. Kvitsinskiy and experts from the Defense Ministry, Foreign Ministry, and other departments. The world press continues to devote close attention to the visit. That is understandable: The visit to the United States by the chief of general staff was designed to eliminate the keen contradictions which had arisen between the two countries over the treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe.

How did the visit end—with success or failure? Our correspondent's questions are answered by a member of the Soviet delegation, Lieutenant General F. Ladygin, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Treaty and Legal Directorate.

[Ladygin] There can be no question of failure, Fedor Ivanovich said. I shall quote to you the words the U.S. President said to his journalists on the day after the meeting with Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of General Staff, which, incidentally, was not planned in advance and which took place at G. Bush's initiative. "It took place very well," the president said. "It advanced matters... I am pleased with the meeting." As you can understand, such assessments are not given of failure.

[Litovkin] But forgive me, epithets and assessments are not an argument. There should be some material proof of the visit's results.

[Ladygin] If we are speaking of "material" proof of success, then judge it for yourself. We succeeded in finally settling the question of the arms in the three coastal defense divisions in the north of our country, the Baltic, and the Black Sea, that is in the region of the application of the treaty on conventional armed forces in

Europe, which were formed in the Navy in 1988 back when the Vienna talks mandate was still being drafted. It is a case of 813 tanks, 972 armored combat vehicles, and 846 artillery systems which are at these divisions' disposal. That is the quantity of arms which we shall additionally reduce within the deadline stipulated by the treaty.

[Litovkin] That is we have made very large concessions?

[Ladygin] Yes, these are concessions by us, but outside the framework of the treaty. Although our interests were nevertheless considered. The U.S. side agreed that the armored personnel carriers guarding the positions of the strategic missile troops, there are incidentally 1,701 of them, are not included in the overall ceilings for conventional forces limitation.

The most sensitive question was that of the arms of the naval infantry, traditionally a component of the Navy. According to the mandates of the talks, on which our partners and primarily the United States particularly insisted, these forces were excluded from the subject matter of the talks.

In Washington we suggested "freezing" the 120 tanks, 753 armored combat vehicles, and 234 artillery systems in the four naval infantry brigades of the Northern, Baltic, and Black Sea fleets without including them in the limitation ceilings. Incidentally, we suggested that similar decisions could also extend to other states signing the treaty which also have such forces.

But this proposal was not adopted.

During the quite complex talks we set about "compensating" for these quantities of arms with the equipment which under the treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe should have been deployed at depots. That is we expressed the readiness to reduce this quantity of equipment at the depots and then in total our arms in the ground forces, coastal defense, and naval infantry would not exceed the overall levels.

That ensured a breakthrough during the chief of general staff's visit to Washington and the success of the talks as a whole. An obvious rapprochement of viewpoints emerged. But one more question remained unagreed—the number of arms in the regular troops.

[Litovkin] You are speaking of the tanks moved across the Urals?

[Ladygin] No, it is a case of those arms which are in the European part of the USSR. The question of these arms will be agreed in the very near future, as we agreed in Washington.

As for the tanks and other equipment which we moved across the Urals before signing the treaty, that question was also discussed. It may be said that our partners' concern has been eliminated. I think this problem no longer exists.

[Litovkin] Let's sum up the results. Can we say that during the visit to Washington by the chief of general staff the military have, by their concessions, created conditions for a summit meeting?

[Ladygin] The question of a summit meeting was indeed raised by the U.S. Administration depending on whether or not the problems concerning the treaty on conventional armed forces are settled. And in this connection I would not speak of concessions. Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of General Staff, was fulfilling the personal instructions of the USSR president. You should understand one simple thing: It was not so much a question of tanks—although that too is important—as of the two great powers' trust in each other, which has strengthened in recent years, and of the entire complex of Soviet-U.S. relations and ultimately of the fate of perestroyka. And here you cannot manage without compromises.

Memorandum Signed on Scientific Cooperation

LD2105182691 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 21 May 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] A memorandum on the participation of Soviet and American scientists in setting up international research centers in Siberia has been signed in Novosibirsk, within the framework of an agreement between the two countries on cooperation concerning fundamental problems common to all mankind.

[V. Tyabotin] The program of the Siberian branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences for organizing international research centers, such as those for humanitarian and biospheric research in Altay, ecological at Baykal, aerophysical in Novosibirsk, closed ecosystems in Krasnoyarsk, and the development of northern territories in Yakutsk and Tyumen, has evoked great interest in the United States. This was confirmed during the current meetings of scientists in Moscow and Novosibirsk and registered in official documents of the second session of the mixed Soviet-U.S. commission headed by academician Laverov, USSR deputy prime minister, and Dr. Bromley, director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy of the White House. [passage omitted]

Correspondent on Gates' Nomination

PM0306151391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 91 Second Edition p 7

[Report by correspondent V. Linnik: "Dead Men Do Not Alter Their Testimony. Toward the Confirmation of R. Gates as CIA Director"]

[Text] Nominated by G. Bush for the post of CIA director, R. Gates, a youthful native of Kansas with a sportsmanlike bearing, and a professional intelligence officer for the past quarter-century, is preparing for hearings in Congress. The hearings, which are required

by U.S. law in accordance with the confirmation procedure, are to begin next month. But, for the time being, the preparations for them have been begun by the U.S. press, which has conceived the idea of doing the legislators' "homework" for them and raising the questions which, in the newspapermen's opinion, must be aired during the sessions.

This is the second opportunity for Gates to become the head of the U.S. intelligence community. As is known, R. Reagan first nominated him for this post in 1987. At that time, after four days of talks with senators, Gates withdrew his candidacy, not wishing to complicate his own life and the president's. Thanks to this, a whole number of questions concerning Gates' involvement in the celebrated "Iran-Contrasgate" [as published] scandal went unanswered. As the reader may recall, it was a question of illegal arms deliveries to Iran in exchange for hostages and of using the proceeds from the weapons to give military aid to the Nicaraguan Contras.

During the last hearings the legislators were somewhat troubled by the fact that Gates, the "number two" in the CIA at that time, knew so little about the underground affairs of Lieutenant Colonel O. North, a National Security Council staffer, and of his chief—Admiral Poindexter, the president's assistant for national security affairs. These two were convicted and are now whiling away their time submitting countless appeals and petitions for review—which, taking into account the extremely involved nature of the whole business, is dragging out the administration of justice ad infinitum. The notorious "Iran-Contrasgate" affair is one of those affairs in America with regard to which the establishment of the truth, if it is indeed possible in principle to establish it, will not in any case—as it has been customary to say—happen in the lifetime of the present generation. Bigshots from the highest echelons of U.S power were involved in it. There is a great deal that some, like former President Reagan, do not remember and that others, allegedly, do not know; while yet others have departed for another world...

Although Gates' testimony at that time supposedly did not contain any direct distortions, there was, as it were, an aura of reticence about it. The newspaper VILLAGE VOICE, which devoted a very detailed article to Gates' role in "Iran-Contrasgate," believes that he manifestly did not tell the commission everything he knew about the illegal operations of North and Poindexter. In particular, he had access to top-secret radio intercepts which several times spoke directly of the Iranian leadership's complaints about a sixfold markup for the weapons being sold to Iran. It was the proceeds from this that went to purchase arms for the Contras. True, during the hearings Gates did recall North's enigmatic remarks at lunch one day about Swiss bank accounts and the Contras but did not attach significance to them. He probably thought it was a question of North's personal money. After an aircraft carrying weapons for the Contras was downed in Nicaragua in 1986, E. Hasenfus, the surviving crew member, admitted he was working for the CIA. Gates asked North at the time whether the CIA was involved in this matter. North replied by saying that the CIA was "absolutely clean." Why, VILLAGE VOICE asks, did Gates start asking North about this if he supposedly did not know of the illegal nature of the whole operation?

The statement to the congressional commission by W. Casey, then CIA director, contained a number of subsequently established discrepancies with the facts. But Casey has died, and dead men, as we know, do not alter their testimony.

"Iran-Contragate" is gradually becoming the property of history. Many of the legislators who at that time were inclined, on a wave of fresh exposures, not to trust Gates have now swapped anger for charity. "Gates showed himself to advantage during the crisis in the Persian Gulf," Senator A. Specter acknowledged. It is obvious that the current President never had any doubts at all about Gates' honest and law-abiding nature. Right after his election he made him number two on the U.S. National Security Council.

Many questions have occurred to U.S. newspapermen with regard to the role played by Gates in the events directly preceding the war in the Persian Gulf. They relate to the large-scale U.S. aid to Iraq which two U.S. administrations gave to Baghdad during 1983-1990. During that time Iraq received credits from Washington to buy food to the tune of $5.5 billion. Baghdad spent some of those funds directly on the purchase of the latest arms, and some went to bribe Iraqi Government officials. In addition, those credits untied Iraq's hands to use its proceeds from exports to acquire weapons from other countries. At that time Iraq was one of the countries with which trade was prohibited by U.S. law. Nevertheless, in its desire to assist Iraq in the war against the United States' worst enemy at that time—Iran—Washington broke the law. High-tech goods worth tens of millions of dollars were sold within the framework of aid to Baghdad, and they played a considerable role in creating Iraq's chemical, bacteriological, and missile potential.

Several officials in various U.S. departments tried at that time to stand on the shaky ground of legality and opposed the allocation of credits and the sale of weapons to Baghdad. They included, in particular, D. Kloske, then under secretary of commerce responsible for export control issues. Conflicts among individual departments over this were resolved in a special subdivision of the National Security Council called the "deputies' committee." It was headed at the time by Robert Gates, who swept aside all the objections and doubts of the deputy secretaries subordinate to him. Kloske personally sent Gates memorandums in which he substantiated the folly of sales to Iraq of equipment of applied military significance. No action was taken on last summer's memorandums and verbal appeals. And Kloske later lost his post. Will Gates be asked about that during the hearings?

The logic of the presidential campaign now beginning would seem to be bound to incline the Democrats to acute interparty clashes and to prompt them to score points against the administration during the hearings. If this is so, this time it will hardly be possible to get away with four days of hearings. But there are also higher interests, which always suggest to U.S. legislators when it is necessary to call a halt and stop "rocking the boat" for the sake of preserving the system.

The simple-hearted reader—I believe this is what we all are, as the past six years have shown—has a right to ask a vexed question: Why is it that arms sales to Iran and arms deliveries to the Contras are illegal, while the U.S. invasions of Grenada and Panama are absolutely legal? The thing is that U.S. law really is the proverbial ass. It completely closes people's eyes to violations of international law in the case of Grenada and Panama and suddenly displays striking scrupulousness when it comes to temporary U.S. laws like the ban on trade with Iran or Iraq in different years. All these conventions of U.S. jurisprudence turn "Iran-Contragate" into one more tempest in a teapot. But 100-percent propaganda dividends are secured. "See what legalists we are, if we are principled in juridical niceties"—this is precisely what the U.S. propaganda machine is trying to say to the rest of the world.

U.S. Rebuked for Yugoslav 'Interference'

91UF0807A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 May 91 First Edition p 5

[TASS correspondent Yu. Kornilov report for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA: "Anger or Favors?"]

[Text] Belgrade—The constitutional and political crisis has lasted for almost two weeks in Yugoslavia now, as a result of which a chairman of the SFRY Presidium—the country's highest official body—has not yet been elected. The representatives of some republics (Croatia, Slovenia) are advocating the election as chairman of S. Mesic, while the representatives of Serbia and the autonomous regions of Vojvodina and Kosovo, which are a part thereof, are objecting to this, citing as the reason for their position the fact that Mesic is a supporter of the separatist policy of the Croatian leadership campaigning for a demolition of the federal structures. The current situation is causing concern in the international community.

Washington also has responded to the events in Yugoslavia, but in a highly distinctive manner. First it became known in Belgrade that U.S. President G. Bush had telephoned A. Markovic, head of the Yugoslav Government, and assured him that the U.S. Administration "expresses full support for Yugoslavia at this difficult time for it." But the Belgrade press had hardly had time to publish these positive balanced words before a statement of directly opposite content from Washington followed: The U.S. State Department announced that the United States was suspending economic assistance to Yugoslavia. What had happened? Certain U.S. circles are, apparently, unhappy with "the behavior of Serbia," which allegedly "bears responsibility for repressive measures against the Albanians in Kosovo and the destabilization of the Yugoslav Presidium."

We will not dwell in detail on the complex and ambivalent "Kosovo problem" but note merely that for many months the situation in this region (as distinct, say, from the state of affairs in Croatia) has been relatively stable and has not been attracting the particular attention of either the European or, even more, the American public. No more convincing is the reference to Serbia's role in the "destabilization of the Presidium"—serious politicians both in Yugoslavia and outside unanimously connect the "power vacuum" in the SFRY with the general state of crisis in the country, by no means with some "intrigues" of some one Yugoslav republic. But all this being the case, the natural question is: What are the real reasons for the demarche of the U.S. State Department?

The answer to this question was unexpectedly given by none other than W. Zimmerman, ambassador of the United States to the SFRY. Talking with a correspondent of BORBA, he spoke in terms of the U.S. decision on a suspension of aid to Yugoslavia not being conclusive, and whether it were to be realized or not would depend not on Washington but on... Belgrade. What, one wonders, must Belgrade do for the transatlantic supporters of economic "sanctions" to substitute favors for their anger? "If the constitutional crisis is overcome and Mr. Mesic is elected chairman of the Yugoslav Presidium, the U.S. secretary of state might attempt to restore the status quo," the ambassador declared.

So, the "i's" have been dotted: Some people in the United States clearly would like, having availed themselves of the exacerbation of the situation and the political confusion in Belgrade, to attempt to fish in troubled waters and with the aid of economic pressure "push" into the top state office of a sovereign country the candidate who, in their opinion, most conforms to American interests! There is no need to show that such methods are derived from the old political arsenal, which had, it might have seemed, long since been consigned to the archives—it is not fortuitous that the State Department so aspires to cover the purposes of its demarche by reference to the situation in Kosovo, which has nothing to do with the matter. And here we have the U.S. ambassador in Belgrade setting forth with wholly undiplomatic straightforwardness everything like it is.

The demarche of the U.S. State Department evoked a sharp rebuke from the Yugoslav side. B. Kostic, for example, prominent statesman and member of the SFRY Presidium, directly accused W. Zimmerman of interference in the country's internal affairs, pointing out that for Yugoslavia freedom and independence had always been more important than any foreign aid. The Belgrade press has expressed itself in the same vein also. Clearly disturbed by this reaction, Washington, it is reported, has already backed off.

Well, it is never too late for anyone to return to the path of good sense and restraint in policy. But will those in the United States who, the spirit of the times notwithstanding, are still inclined to confuse a sovereign and independent European state with the states of Texas or Oklahoma under their jurisdiction, learn the proper lesson from what happened?

U.S. Actions Said To Harm Yugoslavia

91UF0807B Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 May 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent Ye. Vostrukhov: "They Have Accused Serbia and Punished the Whole Country"]

[Text] Belgrade—**The constitutional crisis in the SFRY which broke last week continues. Since 16 May, the federation has been without a president, and the work of its Presidium has in fact been paralyzed inasmuch as the members of the Presidium—representatives of the republics and autonomous regions—are split into two contending groups.**

As already reported, the crisis has set in on account of the imperfections of the Yugoslav Constitution upon the election of a chairman of the Presidium for the coming annual term. According to the Constitution, this chair passes annually on 15 May, by turns, from one representative of a federal entity to another, but, according to the same Constitution, given a "legitimate election," the participation in the ballot of all eight members of the Presidium is required, and it is essential in order to be president to have collected no less than five votes.

Alas, the latest candidate, S. Mesic, the representative of Croatia, collected only four. And now everyone in Yugoslavia is conjecturing as to where the way out of the constitutional deadlock is to be found. Inquiries have been forwarded to the SFRY Skupstina, the Yugoslav Constitutional Court, and prominent legal specialists. And while Belgrade is agonizingly seeking a solution, S. Mesic has resolved to act in an astonishingly simple fashion: He has declared himself president of the Federation. Calling a news conference in Zagreb, he informed journalists that he had sent letters to all members of the Presidium, the head of the SFRY Government, the federal secretaries for internal affairs and national defense, the chief of the Yugoslav People's Army General Staff, and the ambassadors of all countries, in which he notified them that he has automatically, by way of succession, assumed the office of chairman of the Presidium.

Mesic's proclamation of himself as head of state has not been taken seriously either in the SFRY or overseas. But the U.S. Congress, for example, believes even that the culprit in the present crisis is not some contradictory article of the Constitution but the leadership of the Republic of Serbia, which has blocked the work of the Presidium. In addition, the United States has not confined itself to affirmation of this charge but has resolved to punish the "wrongdoers" and apply material sanctions in respect to them. It has just been reported from Washington that Congress has passed the "anti-Yugoslav amendment" of D. Nickles, a senator from Oklahoma, according to which economic assistance to the SFRY is suspended.

As is known, the United States has helped Yugoslavia since 1952, since the time when it was deprived of the patronage of the "socialist camp." As the local press maintains, the country has in these nearly 40 years received from America approximately $40 billion. Hence forward this material support will be suspended. But even more palpable losses could be sustained by Yugoslavia because of the fact that the United States' decision will influence assistance to the SFRY by important organizations—the IMF, the World Bank, the Paris Club, and others. In a word, Yugoslavia could find itself without support precisely when it is most in need of it inasmuch it is implementing profound economic and political reforms.

Thus what has been Serbia's wrongdoing before the senator from far-off Oklahoma? In the opinion of D. Nickles and certain other members of the U.S. Congress, the Serbian leadership has long been violating the rights of the Albanians in the Kosovo autonomous region (it is part of the Republic of Serbia) and now it is blocking the election of a new chairman of the Presidium and creating all kinds of obstacles to the democratization of Yugoslav society. The newspaper BORBA writes in a report from Washington: "Talk has been heard in the U.S. Congress, the White House, and the State Department of late to the effect that relations between the United States and Yugoslavia are now at a crossroads, and this promises new clouds in skies which have long been other than clear...."

True, an attempt was made to dispel the clouds by President G. Bush, who immediately following the State Department statement on the Oklahoma senator's amendment taking effect personally called A. Markovic, head of the Yugoslav Government. The U.S. President informed him that he had made the decision to reconsider the question of a suspension of economic assistance to Yugoslavia. Having thanked him for his kind words, A. Markovic called the President's attention to the need for normal cooperation not only between the SFRY and the United States but also with all international organizations, particularly with the IMF and also to the difficulties which Yugoslavia would encounter were the D. Nickles amendment to go into effect.

Northeast Asia

Petrovskiy on Cooperation With Japan

LD0406204291 Moscow TASS in English 1913 GMT 4 Jun 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Vasily Titov]

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—"We can do a lot together with Japan in order to tap the peace potential of the United Nations and the organisations related to it," Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy made this comment at the end of Soviet-Japanese diplomatic consultations in Tokyo.

Petrovskiy told TASS today that the Soviet Union welcomes Japan's growing interest in supporting the U.N. efforts aimed at strengthening peace, at imparting a universal character to all international organisations acting under the U.N. aegis.

In this context, Petrovskiy described as "very attractive" the measures to reform UNESCO that were proposed by the Japanese side.

Soviet-Japanese interaction not only on traditional global problems, such as settlement of conflicts and crises, but also on new problems that mankind encounters, holds out much promise, he continued. Ecology, combatting drug trafficking and organised crime are the new areas where the two countries can cooperate.

In this context, Petrovskiy characterised as very important the two countries' agreement on the need to enhance the efficiency of next year's international conference on the protection of the environment. According to him, Japan showed great interest in the Soviet proposal to hold this ecological conference at head-of-state level.

Speaking about prospects for Soviet-Japanese cooperation, Petrovskiy singled out contacts between non-governmental organisations of the two countries. Their intensification is also an important factor of improving understanding needed to elaborate specific measures to foster a new world order, he said in conclusion.

USSR Rehabilitates Japanese 'War Criminal'

91UF0805A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Article by Yu. Tavrovskiy: "One Thorn Fewer"]

[Text] Several days ago, the Association "Mutual Understanding" for Aid to Former Japanese Prisoners of War held an unusual ceremony in Moscow. Representatives of the USSR Main Military Procuracy and USSR KGB Lieutenant Colonel V. Vysotskiy and Colonel A. Belyakov handed to R. Saito, president of the Association of Former Japanese Prisoners of War (AFJPW), a document on the rehabilitation of Tsunao Nikaido who was a prisoner of the GULAG between 1945 and 1956, first as a "regular" prisoner of war, and subsequently as a "war criminal."

The essence of the case, as reported by Lt. Col. Vysotskiy, is as follows: Police official Nikaido from the puppet state of Manchou-go set up in China by the Japanese was drafted into the Kwantung Army in 1945, and in August of the same year was taken prisoner by the Soviets and sent to a camp in the vicinity of Chita. In 1948, prisoner of war Nikaido was arrested in the camp "on suspicion of engaging in intelligence activities against the USSR between 1940 and 1945," and on 10 January 1949, he was sentenced to 25 years of deprivation of freedom to be served at a corrective labor camp, by a noncourt ruling of a special panel of the USSR Ministry of State Security. In 1956, Nikaido was released from imprisonment under a ukase of the Supreme Soviet Presidium and returned to Japan.

Ts. Nikaido filed a petition based on the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Ukase, dated 16 January 1989, on Additional Measures To Restore Justice With Regard to the Victims of Repressions Which Occurred During the 1930's, the 1940's, and the Early 1950's, and requested that his case be reconsidered. The case was reviewed by the Main Military Procuracy, and it was established that there was no evidence to support the charges of espionage. In view of this, the noncourt ruling on the charges against Ts. Nikaido was repealed; he was found to be not guilty, and was rehabilitated.

Having thanked "the competent organs" and the "Mutual Understanding" association for their participation in the Ts. Nikaido case, Chairman of the AFJPW R. Saito stressed that "they have begun to remove one more thorn in the side of Japanese-Soviet relations." The first two thorns were removed during a visit to Japan by President M.S. Gorbachev, when lists of the Japanese who had been held by the Soviet Union as prisoners were handed over, and when it was announced that there would be greater opportunities for the relatives of those who died in camps to visit their graves. The issue of rehabilitating the sentenced "war criminals" who were not guilty and issuing compulsory labor certificates to all Japanese who were kept in the camps are the two remaining "thorns."

The rehabilitation of the first of 1,147 Japanese "war criminals" is the beginning of a difficult and, apparently, lengthy job, noted President of the "Mutual Understanding" association A. Kirichenko in an interview given to IZVESTIYA. After all, this category did not include just people who were sentenced solely on the basis of their affiliation with particular elements of the Imperial Army, like Ts. Nikaido. There were genuine criminals, for example, those convicted at the Khabarovsk Trial in December 1949 for inhumane experiments on people with a view to creating highly effective types of chemical and biological weapons. Nonetheless, all petitions requesting that "war crimes" sentences be reconsidered will be accepted. The rest is up to those working in the administration of justice.

Japan on Inviting Gorbachev to G-7 Meeting

LD0306121991 Moscow TASS in English 1020 GMT 3 Jun 91

[By correspondent Aleksandr Kopnov]

[Text] Tokyo June 3 TASS—Japan has not taken the final decision whether or not to invite President Mikhail

Gorbachev to the G-7 summit in London in July, Japanese Cabinet General Secretary Misoji Sakamoto said today.

Commenting on reports that five country participants in the summit have favoured inviting the Soviet president, Sakamoto noted that Japan is planning to announce its position after the leaders of all the seven participants reach a consensus.

The KYODO TSUSHIN AGENCY recalls that last week, Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu said he did not object to the Soviet president's presence at the London summit as a guest after the main issues on the agenda are discussed. He said he did not support Gorbachev's direct participation in the summit.

Gorbachev Greets Soviet-Japanese Exhibition

LD3105204391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 31 May 91

[Text] The USSR president has sent greetings to the organizers and guests of the exhibition "For the survival of mankind in the 21st century". It says:

I greet this joint Soviet-Japanese action. Being undertaken under the aegis of the United Nations Organization, it once again draws attention to the problems of preserving peace, human rights, protection of the environment, and to the inalienable values of the new world order which will be determining the visage of the community of peoples and states in the next century. I hope that the exhibition in Moscow will also become a significant event in Soviet-Japanese relations at their new stage. I wish it all success. The greetings of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev were read out at the ceremony of opening the exposition which is displayed at the USSR Main Committee for Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy.

Japan To Assist Defense Industry Conversion

LD0306194691 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 3 Jun 91

[By correspondent Vladimir Kuchko]

[Text] Tokyo June 3 TASS—The Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry intends to give technical assistance to the Soviet Union in defence industry conversion.

The first specific step will be to send a delegation to Moscow in mid-July. The delegation that will include representatives of the government and private business—industrial and trade companies and banks—will visit a number of defence plants to familiarise themselves with the course of conversion on the spot, a high official of the Japanese ministry told TASS.

As regards financial aid to the USSR, Japan so far has taken up a wait-and-see attitude but the government and business people show an active approach to business cooperation.

Tokyo regards the rendering of assistance to the Soviet Union in the transition to a market economy as a plank of the policy of "balanced expansion" of bilateral relations. This is in line with accords reached during Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's recent visit to Japan, the MAINICHI newspaper points out today.

The Japanese business community shows interest in establishing contacts with Soviet defence plants that convert their facilities to turn out civilian products.

"Cooperation in defence industry conversion has quite good prospects. Our companies have gained experience in this sphere, whereas Soviet plants are believed to possess sufficient scientific and technological potential and qualified workforce," Isamu Yamashita, chairman of the Japanese-Soviet Committee for Economic Cooperation, told TASS.

In post-war years Yamashita headed one of Japan's major shipbuilding companies Mitsui Zosen and was directly in charge of establishing civilian production at the company's plants that previously turned out military products.

Rogachev Receives Japanese Official

PM0406122191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 29 May USSR Deputy Foreign Minister I.A. Rogachev received S. Yanai [name as transliterated], director of the Japanese Foreign Ministry Treaty and Legal Department.

Petrovskiy Urges Arms Curbs at UN Forum

PM0406095591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 91 First Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent I. Latyshev: "Search for New Doctrines"]

[Excerpts] Tokyo, 27 May—The Second UN International Disarmament Conference began work today in the ancient Japanese city of Kyoto. [passage omitted]

Participants in today's plenary sessions listened with great attention to the speech of USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy, who stressed the importance of the realization by the international public that disarmament and ensuring global security for the world's peoples cannot and should not remain just the business of the "superpowers" and that the whole world community should participate in it. The USSR Foreign Ministry representative drew the audience's attention to the

pressing need to transform the national military doctrines of all states so that they become defensive in nature. Petrovskiy placed special stress in his speech on the problem of nuclear disarmament and problems connected with the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, their production technologies, and the production of delivery systems. In this regard he spoke in favor of increasing the international public's efforts to limit supplies of conventional arms and advocated more active involvement of the UN mechanism in this work and, in particular, the creation within the UN framework of an international register of conventional arms sales and supplies.

LDP's Obuchi on Japan-USSR Ties

OW2705175891 Moscow Radio Moscow in Japanese 1300 GMT 24 May 91

[Text] In an interview with a TASS reporter in Tokyo, Keizo Obuchi, secretary general of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party, said:

The Japan-USSR summit talks held in Tokyo in April are of great significance. As a result of the summit talks, mutual understanding between the two countries has deepened, and steps have been taken to expand relations. Although complex issues remain unresolved between the two countries, I intend to do all I can to resolve them and build good-neighborly relations between Japan and the Soviet Union.

Indicating the importance of President Gorbachev's visit to Japan, Secretary General Obuchi went on to say: President Gorbachev is very popular among the Japanese. The Japanese have come to feel closer than ever to the Soviet Union. It is natural for the two countries to cooperate with each other in various areas, including trading and economy. The current world situation has made this possible. I believe that the conclusion of a peace treaty after settling the territorial issue will become the foundation for developing cooperation between the two countries.

DPRK Decision on UN Shows Growing Realism

PM0406095591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent S. Tikhomirov: "Korea Heads for United Nations"]

[Text] Pyongyang—A sudden bomb explosion would probably pale beside the sensation caused by official Pyongyang. KCNA has reported the DPRK Government's decision to join the United Nations on a general basis, as it were.

This last remark is necessary because for many years North Korea has insisted on a formula which envisaged simultaneous entry into the United Nations together with South Korea and the granting to it of a single seat. Pyongyang called parallel membership a way to perpetuate the split of the Korean people. But, as the ancients said, everything changes...

This change in the DPRK leadership's position, the South Korean press is noting, will definitely have far-reaching consequences, and of the most positive kind. Some of these can already been defined without fear of contradiction.

First, this step of Pyongyang's essentially amounts to recognition of South Korea as a sovereign state (until now such claims had been considered virtual blasphemy by the North) which will undoubtedy lead to an easing of tension not only on the peninsula but in Northeast Asia as a whole. Second, I would assess the statement about joining the United Nations as a cautious retreat from the policy of self-isolation and the intention to find its own place in the international community. It was no accident that both the South Korean leadership and all the opposition parties were united in approving the DPRK's decision. The world's leading states have welcomed the decision by the North's government.

We can only guess what or who specifically prompted the DPRK Government to change its position on this issue. For instance, the story has appeared that the decisive argument in favor of "separate" UN membership was allegedly put forward by Li Peng, head of the Chinese Government, during his recent talks with DPRK President Kim Il-song.

Certain observers have rushed to describe this step by Pyongyang as a "loss of face"—after all, it has essentially adopted the South Korean formula. But I think this should not be said now. After all, separate UN membership did not prevent Germany or Yemen from ultimately reunifying. I would note yet again that Pyongyang's decision provides grounds for assuming that, judging by everything, even here in the DPRK a gradual recognition of present-day international realities is taking place.

Gorbachev Sends Condolences on Abe's Death

LD1505191191 Moscow TASS in English 1835 GMT 15 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 15 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev sent heartfelt condolences to the relatives and next-of-kin of Shintaro Abe.

"Shintaro Abe was known in the Soviet Union as a prominent political figure, as a convinced advocate of an improvement of Soviet-Japanese relations, and as a far-sighted politician with whom the start of a new dialogue between our two countries will be associated forever," says the Soviet president's message to Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu, chairman of the Liberal Democratic Party, and to LDP General Secretary Keizo Obuchi.

USSR-DPRK Cultural Protocol Signed

SK0406035391 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1430 GMT 30 May 91

[From the "Various Aspects of Cooperation" program]

[Text] The Soviet Union and the DPRK signed a protocol on cultural and scientific cooperation for 1991-1993 in Moscow.

Station correspondent (Mikhail Kredov) filed the following report:

Culture and science are the fields in which the Soviet Union and the DPRK have never stopped developing cooperation. The document signed a few days ago is a testimony to this point.

The document states the need to further strengthen and develop Soviet-Korean cooperation in such diverse fields as culture, art, science, public health, and sports. The two sides agreed on holding a variety of functions in relation with days and events meaningful to the cultural and social life of the Soviet and Korean peoples, such as joint art festivals and creative [word indistinct].

The two countries' well-known art and writing groups will participate in these functions. They include Omsk Russian People's [name indistinct], Uzbek Ensemble (Bakhor), Moldavian Choir (Doina), Soviet-resident Koreans' song and dance group "Arirang" in Kazakhstan, Alma Ata National Korean Music and Drama Theater, Korean People's Army Song and Dance Ensemble, Mansudae Art Troupe, Korean Art Ensemble, and Pyongyang Acrobatic Theater.

In their interview with Radio Moscow, vice Soviet Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev and DPRK Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the USSR Son Song-pil said the above.

They signed the protocol on cultural and scientific cooperation for 1991-93.

[Begin Rogachev recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] The new thee-year plan envisions the strengthened direct ties between the cultural, educational, and scientific institutions, and mass media organizations, as well as the direct ties between the scientists and cultural activists.

The government-to-government document is characterized by the direct exchanges to be organized between the cities, oblasts, and provinces of the two countries.

The DPRK ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Soviet Union said the following:

[Begin Son recording] I also am very pleased over the protocol on cultural exchanges for 1991-93 signed by our two countries. I believe that the signing of this protocol will greatly contribute to continuing the cultural exchanges that our two countries have continued up until now and to helping the peoples of our two countries understand each other in the course of carrying the cultural exchanges.

Each people has its own national culture characteristic of its own culture. Developing such culture is important not only for the prosperity of its own people, but it also plays an important role in promoting friendship and understanding with other peoples through exchanges.

For this reason, we are making efforts to establish relations of cultural exchanges with all of the countries that are friendly to us and want to develop such relations.

The Soviet Union is one of our closest neighbors and allies and our two countries have long continued cultural exchanges.

Just as mentioned by Comrade Vice Minister, many art troupes and cultural organizations have exchanged mutual visits. In the process, these cultural exchanges have contributed to deepening the mutual understanding between peoples in the two countries and to developing friendly relations.

As is expected, I am convinced that this newly-signed protocol will contribute to rendering the cultural exchanges between our two countries more active and in the process to promoting the mutual understanding and friendship between our two peoples.

We will do our best to realize what this document contains.

Concluding, I extend my gratitude to all the comrades involved in this document who have made every possible effort for the signing of this document and who have also made the signing of this document today possible. [end recording]

DPRK Army Political Workers Arrive in Moscow

PM2805131191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 May 91 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Delegation Arrives"]

[Text] A delegation of leading political workers of the Korean People's Army headed by Colonel General Yi Pong-won, first deputy director of the Korean People's Army General Political Bureau, arrived in Moscow on 23 May at the invitation of the USSR Armed Forces Main Military Political Directorate.

The delegation was met at the airport by N.I. Shlyaga, chief of the USSR Armed Forces Main Military Political Directorate and USSR first deputy defense minister, and other officials.

DPRK Army Aide Cited on Soviet Visit

PM0306115991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 May 91 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Colonel General Yi Pong-won, first deputy chief of the DPRK People's Army General Political Bureau, by correspondent Major M. Zheglov; date and place not stated: "Developing Traditional Links"]

[Text] A delegation of leading political workers from the DPRK People's Army is in our country on an official visit. Our correspondent Maj. M. Zheglov met with its leader, Col. Gen. Yi Pong-won, first deputy chief of the DPRK People's Army General Political Bureau.

[Zheglov] Comrade Col. Gen. perhaps you could tell us about the aims of your visit to our country. And, no doubt, it is already possible to sum up some of the results...

[Yi] I feel confident that our countries' peoples will continue to develop friendship and cooperation by realizing the traditional links which have formed between us. It was in this context, too, that our delegation's visit took place. During meetings and talks with the USSR defense minister, the chief of the Main Military-Political Directorate, and the commanders and political workers of the units we were able to visit we exchanged work experiences and expounded our respective views on the development of the political situation in our countries and in the world in general, and we discussed the present status of and prospects for our future cooperation. I have no doubt that our visit will help to strengthen links and deepen mutual understanding and cooperation between our armies' political organs.

[Zheglov] Do you think you could share with us your impressions of your meetings with our soldiers?

[Yi] Wherever we went, Soviet servicemen received us warmly. We heard truthful stories of Soviet soldiers' living and service conditions and discussed the problems which worry them and which are currently being resolved in the armed forces. I would like to note that everywhere we felt that the Soviet Armed Forces are a stabilizing element in Soviet society and that they are fighting for the unity of the country and oppose separatism. We are convinced that the Soviet people will soon achieve socioeconomic stabilization, and we wish them every success.

[Zheglov] Our readers would like to obtain information at firsthand, so to speak, on the level of authority the DPRK People's Army commands in society. How do young people relate to service in the armed forces?

[Yi] Soldiers in the DPRK People's Army today are actively fighting for a higher level of combat readiness. Apart from purely military training, our armed forces participate widely in the work of our national economy, demonstrating in practice the unity of army and people. To these ends, in the last few years 150,000 servicemen from the DPRK People's Army have been employed on national economic construction sites. We know what the army means to the people and the role it plays in defending our country's territorial integrity and independence. This is why the people love our armed forces and actively assist them in everything. In our country, the families of servicemen and soldiers who have perished and veterans are surrounded with honor and respect. Young people consider army service and the armed defense of the socialist motherland as a respected duty and a great honor.

Official on Easing DPRK-ROK Relations

SK2705131491 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1200 GMT 25 May 91

[From the "Focus on Asia" program; Interview with Oleg Davydov, Soviet Academy of Diplomacy official from the Foreign Ministry, by station reporter (Vadim Kavayev); date and place not given—Davydov recording in Russian fading into Korean translation]

[Text] An international seminar was held sometime ago in Moscow under the slogan, "The issue of peace and security in Northeast Asia, moving towards the 21st century." About 100 scholars and social activists from the Soviet Union, China, the United States, the ROK, Mongolia, Canada, and Japan participated in the seminar.

Today we will introduce an interview with Oleg Davydov, official of the Academy of Diplomacy of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, who participated in this seminar as a representative of the Soviet delegation.

Station reporter (Vadim Kavayev) asked him to state his personal opinion on the situation on the Korean Peninsula.

[Davydov] "During the late eighties a series of new military and political talks between the North and South began through the Red Cross Society, including economic talks. Oleg Davydov states as such and continues to say that military and political talks are especially bringing about hope to the social circles of the North and South and the world's opinion.

This is because such high-level official talks between the two sides, that is the premiers' talks, were held for the first time. However, talks at this time has been postponed. Pyongyang is emphasizing that Seoul is staging the team spirit joint military exercise with the United States and carrying out the policy of breaking up dialogue. Regardless of the proposals by the ROK to resume the premiers' talks, the DPRK has no intention to do so."

[(Kavayev)] What is blocking the dialogue between the North and South?

[Davydov] "I believe it is because both sides do not have mutual understanding. Seoul and Pyongyang must resolve the issue of easing military tension on the Korean

Peninsula in the near future. There is distinct military potential in the North as well as in the South. According to observers they assess that the number of Armed Forces between the North and South exceed over one million forces.

The U.S. forces and nuclear weapons are deployed in the ROK. This reality arouses grave apprehensions. I believe that neighboring countries such as the Soviet Union, the United States, China, and Japan can play an important role in easing military tension on the Korean Peninsula.

These countries have over a long period of time given military assistance to the North and South. Now they will hold discussions on this issue. For example the United States and the Soviet Union compared the military potential between the North and South and have started a consultative meeting regarding this issue. Through this they will be able map out ways to adjust the volume of weapons that are being supplied and carry out step by step plans to reduce weapons during a definite period of time."

[(Kavayev)] However, there can be different views regarding this matter. For example this can be considered as internal interference toward the North and South. Here, it is necessary for the DPRK leadership to have mutual understanding regarding this matter.

[Davydov] "Of course we must hold close negotiations with the DPRK regarding the Far East and the military and political situation on the Korean Peninsula. I would like to indicate that discussions were already held regarding the Korean Peninsula issue during the USSR-US summit talks. Some experience have been accumulated and this must be developed. Moreover, the problem of tension on the Korean Peninsula is so urgent that its solution cannot be delayed."

USSR Attends Conference on Northeast Asia

LD2705062391 Moscow TASS in English 0533 GMT 27 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Prokhorov]

[Text] Tokyo May 27 TASS—A three-day international conference on the problems of Northeast Asia opened in Tokyo today. It was organized by the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI SHIMBUN and U.S. George Washington University with the participation of the newspaper IZVESTIYA.

Prominent political scientists, economists, and high-ranking military leaders from the United States, Japan, China, Mongolia, South and North Korea, and the Soviet Union will discuss the political, economic, and military problems of the region and ways to strengthen peace and security in Northwest [as received] Asia.

One of the main subjects of discussion during the first day of the conference proceedings will be the economic situation in the Soviet Union and the impact of restructuring being effected in the USSR on the state of affairs in East Asia.

The conference is being attended on the Soviet side by S. Razov, head of a Soviet ministry directorate, A. Kortunov, departmental chief at the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies, and Colonel General V. Novozhilov, commander of the troops of the Far Eastern Military District.

Moscow Forum on Asia-Pacific Issues Ends

LD2405033491 Moscow TASS in English 1140 GMT 23 May 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Vasiliy Titov]

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—The development of the dialogue and a search for new forms of cooperation in the economy, policy and the humanitarian sphere is the only way to turn the Asia- Pacific region into a zone of peace and goodneighbourly relations between nations.

This conclusion was drawn by the international scientific conference "Problems of Peace and Security in the Northeastern Asia- Pacific Region: Glance Into the 21st Century." The conference ended today after a three-day discussion.

The meeting debated how to lower the level of military confrontation in the region, to step up integration processes and to expand humanitarian exchanges.

Scientists and economists from the United States, South Korea, China, Mongolia and the Soviet Union concurred in the opinion that their dialogue was important to draft measures to strengthen confidence and overcome political and economic divisions in this important area.

Under the conference programme, the forum established the international fund for cooperation between Asia-Pacific countries. Moscow University Rector Anatoliy Logunov was elected fund chairman.

Conference participants were today received at the Soviet parliament committee for international relations.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Jakarta Cambodia Meeting Previewed

PM0406134191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 May 91 Union Edition p 6

[Report by V. Ganshin: "Restrained Optimism in Jakarta"]

[Text] It is expected that the session of the Supreme National Council [SNC] of Cambodia will open 2-4 June in the Indonesian capital and talks will continue within its framework on a peaceful settlement of the conflict which has been rending the country for over 10 years now. Representatives of all four conflicting sides—the

government and the three opposition groupings—intend to travel to Jakarta at the invitation of the Indonesian and French cochairmen of the international conference on Cambodia in Paris and the UN secretary general.

The main topic of the discussions, Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas has said, will be the linkage of the role of the SNC with the role of UN representatives during general elections and the establishment of the new government, ways of implementing agreements on a cease-fire and the demobilization of the rival sides' troops, and also the mechanism for averting the policy and practice of genocide.

It seems to me that the last item on this list could be the hardest barrier to overcome for the participants in the meeting. The point is that in Phnom Penh's opinion (this thought was voiced recently by Hun Sen, chairman of the Cambodian Council of Ministers, in an interview with the newspaper LE MONDE), the opposition forces, primarily the "Khmers Rouges," have now been substantially undermined. The protracted war which they are waging with the government has failed to produce the expected results. They have heavy losses of personnel, weapons, and ammunition and the aid which used to flood in from abroad has now been substantially reduced. So that the "Khmers Rouges"' chances of achieving the overthrow of existing power and returning to Phnom Penh by armed means can be regarded rather as purely theoretical. And therefore their attempt to use the UN plan to achieve their aims by political means is entirely feasible.

When in the fall of last year the five permanent members of the UN Security Council suggested a package of measures for the settlement of the Cambodian conflict, it was approved in principle by all opposing sides. Although even then the assessments of individual provisions of this plan were diverse. Today it is obvious that its lack of any reliable guarantees against the "Khmers Rouges" coming to power as a result of the elections is one of the most vulnerable spots in the proposed settlement. In Phnom Penh's opinion, of the 12 places in the SNC—that provisional organ of power—half should belong to representatives of the government and half to the opposition, while the other side has insisted on the equal participation of all forces in the SNC, that is three representatives from each of the rival sides. If the plan for the allocation of SNC places proposed by the opposition is adopted, a coalition between the "Khmers Rouges" and any other opposition faction (let us recall that they all oppose the government) would give them a majority in the SNC and consequently the opportunity to form new state structures as they see fit.

Ultimately this proposal of the opposition's did not get through and the SNC was formed on the basis of the principles put forward by Phnom Penh. But the "Khmers Rouges" are continuing to seek ways of obtaining a "legal" majority in the SNC. That is why the Cambodian Government is so persistent in its demands to ensure guarantees (including from the great powers) that those who are guilty of genocide and whose policy led to the deaths of nearly 3 million Cambodians are not allowed to come to power. I think the justice of this way of raising the question is understood by the initiators of a settlement outside Cambodia. The logic of former priorities is preventing them from taking the final step and officially denouncing Pol Pot and the Pol Pot regime and taking specific measures against their bids. The forthcoming Jakarta meeting will hardly be able to resolve that problem. At the same time the search for compromises is continuing and consequently hope remains.

Commentary Assesses Cambodian Talks in Jakarta

BK0506053691 Moscow Radio Moscow in Cambodian 1100 GMT 4 Jun 91

[Station Commentary]

[Text] Representatives of Cambodian parties which form part of the supreme national council, Cambodia's transitional authority, and the cochairmen of the Paris international conference on Cambodia [PICC] have been meeting in the Indonesian capital. In other words, the meeting comprises all the parties which, one way of another, are involved in the solution to a conflict which has torn the country asunder for over 10 years.

The essence of the meeting this time around is simple. How close can it bring each side's stance to one another? Opening the meeting, the Indonesian representative, as host, appealed to parties taking part in the meeting to first consider the nation's supreme interest, and through mutual concessions, end the tragedy in Cambodia.

However, reconciliation is a very complicated matter. One point, the weakest in the plan for a solution, is that there is no satisfactory guarantee against the Khmer Rouge's return to power. This group's rule in the second half of the 1970's was an unprecedented tragedy for the nation. For four years when it was in power, the Pol Pot regime annihilated nearly three million people of a fairly small country. Now the Khmer Rouge are still grossly seeking the way to return to control the country and receive the majority of seats in the SNC. This is why the Cambodian government so ardently demands a guarantee from even the major powers to prevent those guilty of genocide from returning to power.

Comrade Chairman of the State of Cambodia's Council of Ministers Hun Sen said at this meeting he can take measures, along with others, including military ones, to prevent Pol Pot's ideological accomplices from returning to power. Comrade Hun Sen met with Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, who, as is known, is not a member of the SNC. The two sides agreed to hand over the SNC chairmanship to the samdech; and this ought to be considered as an important agreement and another step toward solving the Cambodian problem.

However, once again, a destructive factor emerged from the Khmer Rouge. Toward the end of the meeting, this

group's ringleaders refused to support the agreement. The Khmer Rouge leaders threatened that if the Jakarta talks failed, they would resume fighting. The only conclusion that can be drawn from this is that the Pol Pot leaders, like before, still pin their hopes on seizing power in the country through military means.

It ought to be said that at the meeting in Jakarta it was agreed to extend the cease-fire which has been in effect since 1 May. The meeting this time around failed to solve and cannot solve many issues. However, it has shown that the search for a path of reconcilion still continues. In other words, there is still hope.

Moscow Views Cambodia-Vietnam Rail Link

BK0506071491 Moscow Radio Moscow in Cambodian 1100 GMT 4 Jun 91

[Text] The eastern part of Cambodia is marked by huge rubber plantations, the biggest of which were set up in the mid-30's. However, it is regrettable that to this day rubber products, the country's most important export item, are hard to sell in foreign markets. It is only a dream that annual rubber products will regularly be exported.

Now Cambodia and Vietnam have recently signed an agreement on cooperation in building the first railway line linking the two neighboring countries. From the Cambodian capital, the railroad will lead to the eastern part of the country and the Chhup rubber plantation. From there it will go through Memot district seat and the border and on to the south to Loch Ninh town in Vietnam where the new railraod will be merged into the Vietnamese railway network. Through this railroad, rubber products will be transported to the coast. This railraod will also carry a lot of merchandise to Cambodia. Material from the eastern part of the country and from Vietnam will be carried on the shortest route to Phnom Penh, which is linked by rail to the port in the southern part of the country, and to Battambang Province, the area with immense ricefields.

Therefore, following the construction of the Phnom Penh-Loc Ninh railraod, the Cambodian economy will quickly develop. According to the protocol recently signed in Phnom Penh, this railroad will be built through the two countries' efforts. Vietnam has allocated funds for this project; it will also train Cambodian staff to serve the railway line.

Finally, I would like to note another important point. A few decades ago it was clearly realized that the Phnom Penh-Loc Ninh railroad was necessary. However, it is regrettable that insurmountable political obstacles blocked the project from being realized. Now that Cambodian-Vietnamese relations have become normal and with the common border agreement, which long ago ended border conflicts, the construction of this major railroad will most likely be realized.

Analyst Views Asia-Pacific Detente Prospects

LD0106092691 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 30 May 91

[Commentary "on the prospects for a military detente in Asia and the Pacific," by military affairs observer Lieutenant Colonel Sergey Kozlov, in Russian with English voiceover]

[Text] So far only two countries in the region—the Soviet Union and China—have taken major disarmament steps in the region, says our observer. They have reduced their armed forces and have started talks on demilitarizing their common border.

As for this country, in keeping with the INF treaty, all medium and shorter-range nuclear missiles have been destroyed in its Asian part. Besides that, for more than three years running there has been no increase in the number of the Soviet nuclear weapons there. As promised, the group of troops in the east of this country has been reduced by 200,000 men; 16 warships are being withdrawn from the Soviet Pacific Fleet; and finally, this year the pullout of the Soviet troops from Mongolia will be completed ahead of schedule.

It is felt in Moscow that the cause of the military detente in the Asian and Pacific region would be greatly enhanced by a dialogue of the major military powers—the USSR, the United States, Japan, China, and India.

During his recent visit to Tokyo, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev advanced such a proposal without any strings attached. If our partners are willing we are ready to discuss any concrete initiatives.

As disarmament talks have brought about such favorable changes in international relations in Europe, there's no reason to reject them in Asia. Unfortunately Washington is yet to respond to the Soviet proposals. So far it shows practically no reaction.

An ASSOCIATED PRESS report has been noticed in this country to the effect that by next year a total number of 14,000 American soldiers will be withdrawn from Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines. However, this move cannot be regarded as significant. Even less so because of reports that the United States Defense Department does not plan any dramatic cuts in its forces in the Asian and Pacific region.

In short, Washington is responding rather cautiously to the appreciable warming in the international climate in the region. Whatever the case, the prospects for a military detente in Asia and the Pacific are far from dark, unlike what many people still believe at least due to the fact that without easing the military tensions it is difficult to picture a successful advancement in that region to prosperity [sentence as heard]. Understandably no big military power can stay on the sidelines.

Baker Chides Australia's Evans Over Proposal

PM1705084391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 May 91 First Edition p 4

[Correspondent A. Ivkin "Rejoinder": "'Older Brother' Unhappy"]

[Text] Sydney—The United States, with its mighty Navy deployed in positions a long way from its native shores, will continue to call the shots in the Pacific Ocean without any restrictions, and no efforts to limit this U.S. naval might in Pacific waters will be accepted by Washington—this is the gist of U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker's confidential letter of 16 November last year to Senator G. Evans, Australian minister of foreign affairs and trade, which has reached the Australian press.

Mildly, in a manner befitting an "older brother," Baker reproaches his colleague for what America considers to be the unforgivable hastiness of Evans' proposal of October last year. This talked of ensuring that all countries of the region embarked on "dialogue" to discuss a new regional security system.

Baker considers this very sensible idea hasty because, he says, the Soviet Union will certainly be able to seize upon Australia's proposal. After all, it is the Soviet Union which, according to Washington's logic, dreams day and night of establishing control over naval arms in the region. And this, Baker stresses, runs counter to the interests of the United States and Australia.

In short, there is no need for a new regional security system, the "older brother" from Washington writes to the younger brother in Canberra. Especially as the existing security structures, in the Washington administration's view, are wholly adequate for the situation and any change can only reduce American influence in this region of the world.

In his letter of reply, G. Evans merely ventured to remind J. Baker that the Pacific countries are dealing with the same Soviet Government which, in his words, embarked on a fundamental transformation for the better in East-West relations.

We do not know what Baker thought about this. We do know, however, that the mere mention of possible control over naval activities, let alone arms reduction, in the Pacific makes Washington wince and prompts a categorical "no."

Philippine Military Chief on CPP Legalization

HK1805050791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Tagalog 1400 GMT 17 May 91

[Text] The Communist Party of the Philippines [CPP] should be legalized. This was the proposal of the Armed Forces of the Philippines chief of staff, General Lisandro Abadia. According to General Abadia, the Armed Forces have a standing proposal for the legalization of the CPP-New People's Army on condition that it abandon its armed struggle and only engage in political activities. Abadia said that CPP's political participation could help resolve the 22-year old insurgency problem.

Near East & South Asia

Four Villagers Killed in Afghan Border Bombing

LD0406151691 Moscow TASS in English 1508 GMT 4 Jun 91

[By correspondent Yevgeniy Znamenskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—Five bombs were dropped today on the settlement of Namadguti-Poen on the Soviet side of the River Pyandzh (Panj), killing four local residents, TASS learned at the main frontier troops department of the USSR State Security Committee (KGB).

A frontier detail recorded the flight of a jet plane above Afghan territory along the state border of the USSR at 8:08 Moscow time.

The plane dropped five bombs, out of which four exploded, killing four people and wounding several others. The bombing destroyed a farming machinery depot and a bus terminal.

Competent bodies have launched an investigation.

Progress Toward Afghan Settlement Emerges

PM0306161391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 May 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by Yu. Tyssovskiy: "Afghanistan: Progress?"]

[Text] "Afghan guerillas are planning to meet next month in Pakistan for a peace conference to call a halt to the war against the communist government in Kabul which has been going on for 13 years, Pakistani and Afghan sources reported."

This short report, which appeared on the REUTER wire service a few days ago, evoked mixed feelings for me personally. On the one hand, I know the worth of this sort of report from Pakistani and Afghan sources. Official Islamabad and Peshawar, where the leaders of the "Afghan resistance" are entrenched, have frequently made statements about their "commitment" to a political settlement of the Afghan problem, but upon examination it has inevitably turned out that behind these assurances there lurks a desire to secure the aim of overthrowing the government of the Republic of Afghanistan by naked force, and not by means of an expression of the will of the majority of the Afghan people. However, on the other hand, today our attitude to the REUTER report should clearly be different, bearing in mind the general political context in which these statements are made.

It is well known that the intra-Afghan conflict is essentially not such because of the sometimes covert and

sometimes direct interference in it by external forces. A little over two years ago we too were one of the parties to it, but since the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of our southern neighbor, the USSR's role in the events in Afghanistan has been reduced to supporting the Republic of Afghanistan government in its confrontation with the rebels and to providing material, technological, and military assistance. I immediately want to stress that this is being done not for the sake of keeping "Soviet puppets" in power, as Radio Liberty claims quite often. Kabul and Moscow have frequently emphasized their agreement to a scenario for settling the situation in the country which would envisage the transfer of power to whoever is elected during free elections held without any discrimination in relation to the political forces taking part in them.

Over this period the position of the United States has also undergone major changes. After the departure of Soviet troops, the Afghan confrontation was "not its war." Realistic awareness of the simple fact that peace in the "land of mountains" can also be achieved by political means, without unnecessary war and its tragic consequences, finally dawned on many American legislators. Hence the sharp drop in support at all levels for the "resistance forces," which have never been able to achieve significant successes in the war against Kabul.

Saudi Arabia, which gives every possible support to certain mujahidin factions in terms of money and weapons, has enough worries of its own in the Arabian peninsula and the Near East as a whole after the "Persian crisis." In the last two years Iran has played quite a constructive role in Afghan affairs by advocating political methods of resolving the neighboring state's problems. With regard to the building of a future Afghanistan the Islamic Unity Party, which it is supports and which includes various groupings of Afghan Shiite oppositionists, adheres in principle to united positions containing nothing of the unacceptable frenzy that characterizes the program of some of the "Islamic parties" in Peshawar.

And, finally, there is Pakistan. The late president-cum-dictator Ziaul Haq subordinated Islamabad's policy to one aim—with the support of the United States and on a wave of anti-Sovietism engendered by our military aid to the Kabul government, to achieve the secret aim of overthrowing the Kabul leadership and setting up a government agreeable to him in Afghanistan as the "fifth province" of Pakistan. The next step was to have been an Islamabad-dominated "Islamic confederation" including Iran, Turkey, and Afghanistan with a plainly anti-Indian and anti-Soviet foreign policy course. A more sober outlook prevailed after the death of the dictator and the coming to power of Benazir Bhutto: The military victory of the mujahidin over government forces rapidly became an unrealizable dream, and the quite impracticable confrontational stance in relation to its neighbors prompted official Islamabad to review the basic guidelines of its policy in the region and beyond. However, under B. Bhutto such an approach was unthinkable since the state's foreign policy was subordinate to the Pakistani Army's Interservices Intelligence (ISI), and this department had enjoyed an entirely free hand since the time of Ziaul Haq. However, habits change with time...

I shall cite just one quotation. "A noticeable shift away from confrontation has occurred in Pakistani policy in relation to Afghanistan," the INDIAN EXPRESS writes. "Even after the withdrawal of Soviet troops, Islamabad continued to support the mujahidin for two years. It is no secret that the ISI once allowed Benazir Bhutto to switch to more flexible positions. Pakistan's present support for the latest UN initiative is striking. The change not only signals that the new prime minister, Nawaz Sharif, is following an entirely realistic course, but also that the ISI must subordinate itself to his policies. If he can manage to extract its officials' teeth, it will be easier for the United States and the USSR to restore the traditional neutrality of Afghanistan."

While not entirely sharing the optimism of the Indian newspaper, I can only say that if Islamabad is really serious in its intention to encourage a political settlement of Afghan problems, this is an important guarantee of success.

It seems that all the above changes in and around the region were borne in mind by B. Sewan, the personal representative of the UN secretary general, whose report about his contacts in Kabul, Islamabad, Tehran, and Peshawar formed the basis on which J.P. de Cuellar prepared his "peace document." This was published in our press, and you do not have to be a great expert in Afghan affairs to notice that the UN secretary general's proposals are largely based on the familiar provisions of M.S. Gorbachev's "peace plan" and Republic of Afghanistan President Najibullah's initiatives. This approach, it seems to me, is based by no means on a desire by the international community to flatter Moscow or Kabul, but on the fact that it is notable for a reasonable and flexible approach and meets the requirements of the situation in Afghanistan.

All the principal parties involved to one extent or another in the conflict favor the UN "peace document." Even a delegation from four (out of the seven) Peshawar parties headed by S. Mojaddedi, the "president of the Islamic transitional government of Afghanistan," has held lengthy talks with representatives of the Islamic Unity Party in Tehran, and has seemingly shown a desire to compromise and an understanding of the real correlation of military and political forces in Afghanistan. Two figures remain isolated. Gulbuddin Hikmatyar, leader of the Islamic Party of Afghanistan and chairman of the most fanatical fundamentalist movement, who on this occasion too has remained true to himself by rejecting the UN plan as "unrealistic." And A.R. Sayyaf, leader of the pro-Saudi Wahhabite organization "Islamic Unity for the Liberation of Afghanistan," has also proved obstinate, stating that any compromise with the "communists" is inconsistent with a "jihad." The

danger here is that in the climate of a general desire for a political settlement neither of them can call the shots, but they can wreck a great deal.

Like everyone with any connection with Afghanistan, I have read with some envy recent reports from Luanda and Havana and from Phnom Penh and Hanoi about how they have found solutions to these chronic regional conflicts. And I confess that I feel disappointed for our southern neighbor, which seemed to have been given a chance for peace by the Geneva accords of 1988. However, it has taken more than three years for the ideas of Geneva to mature in the awareness of all those involved in the continuing Afghan war and to begin "working" for a political settlement. It is necessary to preserve the potential for peace which is gathering momentum and protect it from the encroachments of those who would like to spoil the emerging positive shifts. This is the most important thing.

Afghan Su-25 Attacks, Drops Bombs Inside Border

OW0506013491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 4 Jun 91

[Text] An identified plane flying from Afghanistan at a high altitude crossed the air border of the Soviet Union near the Namatgut village of the Ishkashimskiy region in Tadjikstan Tuesday. Making a turn, it dropped four bombs. Two of them fell on a highway 150 meters away from the border. One exploded by a bus and the other near a GAZ 66 truck.

As a result, four people (the driver of the bus and three passengers) died. One woman, in critical condition, was taken to a hospital. Both cars were burnt out. A medical aviation plane has reportedly left Dushabe for Namatgut.

According to unofficial, but well-informed sources, border guards managed to identify the killer plane. They say it was an Su-24 bomber of the Afghan Air Force.

However, one of the aviation officers who had served in Afghanistan says, "It could be a mistake," because planes of this class were not shipped to Afghanistan and the plane is likely to be an Su-25 attack aircraft.

Israel's Netanyahu on Soviet Leanings to PLO

LD1905124591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1559 GMT 17 May 91

[Interview with Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister Binyamin Netanyahu by commentator Andrey Popov in Israel; date not given—recorded; from the "Settlement of the Palestinian Problem" program; in English with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Popov] What do you think about the chances of finding a solution between Palestinian Arabs and Jews on this land?

[Netanyahu] The PLO is completely in the hands of Saddam Husayn. PLO terrorists stood on house roofs in the occupied territories during the Gulf war and watched Iraq firing missiles on Israel. And when it was stated that half of Israel would be set on fire, they answered: splendid, and if all of Israel would be annihilated then that would be even better. The PLO does not want peace with Israel. It wants peace without Israel and its method is terrorism. And what is very important is that the USSR in relation to the Palestinian problem takes the point of view of the PLO into account first and foremost and the members of this organization, as is well-known, want to drown us in the sea. We must isolate the PLO from those Palestinians who want peace with us. But they are afraid of this organization. Those who try to hold talks with us are killed. This is the reality. We are in favor of peace, but we are in favor of armed peace, since here, on this land, if you cannot defend peace then it is unattainable.

TASS Opens Tel Aviv Office

TA2105042991 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in English 0400 GMT 21 May 91

[Text] The Soviet news agency TASS has opened an office in Tel Aviv. The news agency's representative, (Aleksandr Zodorov), was given a press card yesterday by Government Press Office Director Yosi Olmert. The TASS office will begin to operate within a month.

The approval to open the Soviet news agency office here follows a Soviet decision to approve the stationing of a permanent Israel Broadcasting Authority correspondent in Moscow.

Jewish Organization Notes Emigres' 'Plight'

PM2005133191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Report by V. Lashkul: "Emigres Leave Israel"; last paragraph is postscript]

[Text] A press conference of the USSR VAAD [Confederation of Jewish Communities and Organizations] was held in Moscow. The VAAD leaders drew the attention of the Soviet press to the plight of thousands of Jewish citizens who have left our country to take up permanent residence in Israel.

It was stated at the press conference that Israeli society has proved unprepared to receive immigrants arriving in the country. A VAAD delegation which visited various Israeli cities and population centers saw for itself the hunger strikes, the tent towns in which the olim (new immigrants) live, and protest actions among former Soviet citizens who need to improve their living conditions.

In this connection Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir was presented with a letter from a group of VAAD leaders which says in particular: "The hunger

strike and protest vigil by olim doctors, the demonstrations by the newly repatriated at Lod, and the tent town of the homeless at Carmiel are evidence of the critical situation in the field of absorption, which threatens to turn into a social eruption with unpredictable consequences for the olimy and for Israel as a whole."

Valeriy Engel, member of the VAAD Council Presidium, said at the press conference that despite the Israeli government's well intentioned assurances that it will rectify the situation, so far no real ways of resolving existing problems can be seen. The immigrants' situation is constantly deteriorating. There is a shortage of housing and jobs. The number of unemployed doctors alone from the USSR is reckoned at 6,000 in the country. And there are just 1,500 vacancies for them. Prices for existing apartments have increased considerably.

The VAAD press conference admitted that in fact a large proportion of immigrants from the USSR is socially without identity and professionally useless.

At the last hour, Uri Goden [name as transliterated], chief of the Jewish Agency immigration department, has spoken on Israeli radio. He has stated that the country's government still does not have a serious program for admitting people arriving in Israel and settling them. U. Goden reported that since the beginning of 1991 only 3,000 new immigrants have decided to obtain Israeli passports. This, he says, has been caused by the fact that many of the new arrivals want to leave Israel.

Soviet Specialists To Combat Kuwaiti Oil Fires

LD2005112991 Moscow TASS in English 1056 GMT 20 May 91

[By correspondent Aron Goldenberg]

[Text] Baku May 20 TASS—Firemen from Azerbaijan, Russia, the Ukraine and Kazakhstan will soon fly to Kuwait to work on burning oil wells, Sayd Mamedov, head of the Soviet Interior Ministry Fire Department, told TASS.

A group of Soviet specialists, including Mamedov, recently visited Kuwait to study the oil fields and ways to put out the fires, and select the necessary technical means.

Soviet oilmen will also go to Kuwait to "tame" oil and gas fountains and seal wells after the fire is extinguished.

Azerbaijani specialists have helped stamp out fires at oil and gas fields in Russia, Asia, Kazakhstan, Afghanistan, India, Iran and other countries.

Under a contract, the Soviet firemen will have to put out fires at 100 wells within 150 days.

Soviet Miners To Build Subway in Israel

OW2105061591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1900 GMT 20 May 91

[From "Business Today"]

[Text] The Business Cooperation foreign trade association centered in the Ukrainian mining city of Donetsk has offered Israel the service of Soviet specialists for the planned construction of a subway and other underground projects in Tel Aviv.

According to information issued by the Jewish news agency MA NISHMA, the general director of the association, Anatoly Dermeiner, said that the Donetsk project "has received a positive appraisal" by the Federation of Chambers of Commerce and the Ministry of Energy of Israel.

The Business Cooperation association also intends to offer Soviet mining specialists, who are at present suffering the result of overmanning, for participation in the broad "Two Seas Project", which envisages the building of a network of underground hydroelectric stations in Israel.

Talks Help Break Down Mideast 'Stereotypes'

PM2105090591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 91 Second Edition p 7

[Article by Yuriy Glukhov under "The View From Moscow" rubric: "Destroying Stereotypes"]

[Text] The longest war in human history was the Hundred Years' War. It was fought between England and France between 1337 and 1453. However, the series of crusades to Jerusalem, which took place between 1096 and 1291, is also regarded by historians as one continuous war. Thus, even in the twilight of the Middle Ages, the Near East had acquired dubious renown as a "hot spot." Sadly, it still retains this renown even in our civilized century, breaking all longevity records. The Arab-Israeli conflict has been dragging on since 1948, threatening to take the form of a "hundred years'" war with unpredictable consequences.

This is why every step that aims to break free from the vicious circle of hatred and violence deserves support. Such steps were taken this week by Soviet Foreign Minister A. Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker. Both men made trips to the Near East and held intensive talks with leaders of countries in the region and with each other.

These contacts are backed up by experience already accumulated in cooperation and in overcoming regional conflicts. It is possible to debate the extent to which a particular decision was effective, and about the costs involved, but on the whole a positive process is developing.

It is the first time that a Soviet foreign minister has visited Israel. Given that there are no full diplomatic relations between our countries, this in itself is a remarkable event, although contacts between USSR and Israeli statesmen are becoming the norm even at prime ministerial level. But in this instance it is the first time since 1967 that the Soviet Union has acted as a connecting link at high official level and has carried out an intermediary mission, obtaining information at first hand.

For the first time, too, a Soviet foreign policy department leader has visited Saudi Arabia. Against a background of epitaphs for the USSR's Near East policy both in our own and in the foreign press, the fact remains that there is an interest among Arab countries in broadening and strengthening ties with the Soviet Union and retaining its political support.

And yet again it is the first time that the leaders of the Soviet and American diplomatic departments have synchronized their activities in looking for peace in the Near East. Up to now the United States has preferred to act alone. I would remind readers that Egyptian President H. Mubarak took part in the Soviet-American talks in Cairo. Not just the largest Arab state but also the only one to have diplomatic relations and experience of cooperation with Israel has been linked into the joint search for solutions.

At the present time no concrete results can be distinguished in the reports from the Near East. But, according to J. Baker, it did prove possible to identify more points of agreement than of difference. In my view, a new and more favorable political and psychological climate is being established. What is occurring is a destruction of the stereotypes which, like stocks, were shackling the search for a settlement.

In Arab circles it was thought, for example, that contacts between the USSR and Israel represented a retreat from the defense of the Arab cause. This opinion was current even when Cairo established diplomatic relations with Tel Aviv. Consequently the Soviet Union's diplomatic and political potential was significantly constricted. The logical outcome of this position is continued confrontation, since the primary meaning of a settlement is the establishment of ties. This complex is now being overcome. Meanwhile I am sure that the development of relations with Israel should go ahead in parallel with, and not to the detriment of or at the expense of, our relations with the Arabs.

It appears that the stereotype of a possible "pax Americana" is also crumbling. This stereotype was fed originally by the Camp David accords between Egypt and Israel, and now by the success of American weapons in the proving ground of the Persian Gulf zone. But anomalies are typical of the Near East. Victory on the battlefield still does not signify the final prize. Despite the rout of the Arab states in 1967, Israel did not succeed in imposing its peace terms on the Arabs.

The need for collective efforts and the agreement of all the sides involved in the conflict is obvious. Let us single out the main thing that has already been achieved on this path. To all appearances, nobody is disputing the idea of convening a peace conference. Even this is a big step forward. Syria, which declined to take part in the Geneva Conference in 1973, is prepared to participate in the upcoming forum.

In my view it is not fundamentally important whether a peace conference is held under U.S. and USSR or under UN auspices. It is merely strange that, for example, the UN sponsorship produced Israeli objections. That state, after all, owes its very birth to the United Nations. UN authority was used to end the conflict between Iraq and Kuwait. Finally, UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 are regarded as the basis for settling the Arab-Israeli dispute, in Washington as well as elsewhere. It is these resolutions that are the basis of the "land for peace" formula. It is also strange that the Israeli leadership is rejecting this formula as well. The Persian Gulf war and the bombardment of Israel by missiles fired from Iraqi territory again demonstrated the illusoriness of territorial acquisitions as a means of guaranteeing security.

This position is provoking criticism even from Israel's American friends. "The Israeli government is pursuing a policy laid down by the country's right-wing forces," the WASHINGTON POST writes. "It states that, by returning Sinai to Egypt, Israel has already fulfilled the international demand to give up land in exchange for peace and it will not consider the prospect of territorial concessions in the West Bank. It is vigorously pursuing the establishment of settlements in the West Bank. It is insisting that the conference take a form that excludes the element of international involvement in a Near East peace. It reckons to determine the composition not just of its own delegation to the conference but also of the Palestinian delegation. These are fallacious positions, even though they are held by a friendly democratic state."

However, let us hear out the arguments of the Israeli side. Y. Ben Dor, Israeli press attache in Moscow, directed my attention to the eternal and tormenting question that alarms Israelis: Are they really being offered a genuine peace? After all, in certain Arab circles and countries Israel is still seen only as some "Zionist invention." It is obvious that the Arabs must renounce this stereotype: Once and for all they must acknowledge that the Jewish state has an equal right to exist in the family of Near East states, and they must not slight it as if it were a foreign body. But Israel will in turn have to make a similar gesture with regard to an independent Palestine.

The Persian Gulf crisis highlighted the sinister aspects of a possible development of the Arab-Israeli conflict, and the scale of the threatening military and ecological catastrophe. It gave impetus to the search for a Near East

settlement. It would be madness not to draw lessons, not to find reasonable solutions.

Problems with Emigration to Israel Viewed

91UF0812A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
29 May 91 First Edition p 5

[Article by Eduard Volodin: "Emigration. Abstraction and Reality"]

[Text] Amman-Moscow—In March I had occasion to read in some semi-perestroyka newspaper a terrifying discussion by a journalist about how in Jordan the poor unfortunate was stoned by some Palestinian boys merely because he was Russian. Therefore, when discussing with Palestinian friends the program for my stay in the Jordan area, I asked them to plan a visit to the Palestinian refugee camps. Not so that I could come under a volley of stones—I will not give anyone that satisfaction. It is simply that after my trip to Iraq last autumn I understood that many newspaper reports, to put it mildly, do not correspond to reality, and it could not be possible for the Arabs' attitude toward my people to change so drastically.

I visited three Palestinian refugee camps located in Amman and its suburbs. They sprang up after the wars of 1946, 1967, and 1973. They have tiny streets where it is difficult for two people to pass. The houses squeeze against one another. There are no spaces for children's games and, as the Palestinians told me, the sewage system was just installed recently. Some children in the street were having a sword fight using iron bars for swords—it is clumsy but lively. When they found out that I was Russian they laughed, saluted me with their "sabers," and continued their amusing battles.

And there beyond the Jordan River was their Palestinian land. Occupied territory, as the state of Palestine is usually called, created along with Israel and seized during the course of aggressive campaigns beginning in 1948 and continuing up to the present. The second generation of Palestinians has never laid eyes on the land of their fathers, and each year larger numbers of Palestinians are driven from their land, from their home, by the Israeli government and the occupation forces. Those who remain in their native Palestinian land are under the constant threat of deportation if they do not show loyalty to the occupation regime, the racist laws, and the religious norms of righteousness and morality. Various methods are used to crowd the Palestinians out of their land, and then it is taken over by Israel. It has been reported in our press that since 1948 Israel has created several hundred cities, towns, and villages. But we forgot to add that since 1948 through the present day this same Israel has destroyed (blown up, dug up, broken up, bulldozed) more than 700 Palestinian cities, towns, and villages. This destruction has always coincided with waves of emigration of Jews to Israel and wars which were encouraged and after which the flow of emigrants increased.

Now the Palestinians are increasingly alarmed by the possible emigration of at least 1 million Soviet Jews to Israel. There are now about 4 million Jews in Israel and a sharp—of more than 25 percent—increase in the population would give rise to problems which the Palestinians and Israel's neighboring states as well as serious-minded people in Israel itself understand very well. The economic problems of accommodating the emigrants are now being discussed by Israeli scholars and politicians. While the annual budget is $14 billion, settlement of the immigrants (housing, jobs, the social sphere, and so forth) would take more than $45 billion. Where this money will come from nobody knows, the more so since the immense monetary infusions from the United States are primarily for outfitting the army. The territory of Israel and what has been seized from Palestine amounts to only 27,000 square kilometers. In a densely populated country, finding room for such an immense mass of population is also a problem which will not be solved by peaceful means in the near future. The emigrants from the USSR are by no means workers and peasants but people employed in science and culture and the sphere of distribution and service. Even now this is creating social tension among the Jewish population of Israel. Even now employment in a different specialty is a typical phenomenon among emigrants from the USSR. And the Israeli press itself is writing about the fact that specialists with high qualifications are being forced to do common labor and women have to work as prostitutes in order to feed their families. There is no doubt that the possible resettlement of a million people in Israel will increase social tension, conflicts, and a decline of the standard of living.

Need one mention that this flow of emigrants will affect the vital interests of the Palestinians? Previous practice has shown that occupied territories will be violently seized and hundreds of thousands of Palestinians will be without work and deported. At the same time there will be a critical mass of population which could (considering the past) provoke another military conflict.

Nonetheless the emigration continues, it is growing, and it is being advertised. Our politicians, and scientists following in their wake with their psychology of "whatever you wish," find the justification and explanation for this in the human rights that are being proclaimed throughout the world. They say there is the Law on Departure of USSR Citizens from the USSR and the inalienable right of freedom to travel. This is an old song and dance from the repertoire of "universal human values," about which I have had occasion to write on the pages of our newspaper. Philosophical abstraction becomes the content of political action and all the "renewalists" rejoice in this questionable union of pure reason and bare politics. It becomes quite embarrassing when these human rights are used to explain to the Arabs in general and the Palestinians in particular the mass movement of Jews from the USSR to Israel. It ends up like this: Some have the human right to freedom of travel while others do not have the right to their own land, their own human dignity, their own home. And there the

Arabs, deprived of their state center, with all of their human rights impinged upon, have to listen to the high-flown demagoguery to the effect that the emigration of Jews from the USSR to Israel is taking place in the name of the highest human rights! They hear it and they understand it as it corresponds to their historical experience of the past 50 years—human rights in their region are declared not for everyone but for the chosen. And they, the Palestinian Arabs, are not granted these rights. It would be all right if this rhetoric were coming from the Americans—the Arabs are quite familiar with their position. But when these, frankly, demagogic torments about human rights with the unquestionable encroachment on the rights of concrete Palestinians come from the USSR, all they can do is throw up their hands in despair and ask what really is happening in the Soviet Union, what its position with respect to the Arab world is, and what the foreign point of perestroyka is if it deprives a great power of its historical and geopolitical allies, friends, and partners. Would it not be simpler to explain what is happening not by philosophical abstractions but by the military- political aims pursued by Israel and the United States?

The military-political explanation, in my view, is as follows. The inhuman reprisal by the United States and its henchmen against Iraq and its people showed that in the Near East, America does not wish to tolerate states with economic and military might comparable to Israel's. The problem is that the dominant role in the Near East belonged to Israel alone, which provided the United States complete control over Arab petroleum resources and the world system of pipelines. The creation of such a center also facilitated the task of crowding the Soviet military fleet out of the Mediterranean Sea, and then the Indian Ocean as well, which made it possible for the submarine and surface nuclear fleet, which comprise the main threat to the USSR, to maneuver freely. Having understood the problem this way, one must agree with the widespread opinion among Arabs that if Europe and the United States are giving Israel arms and money, the USSR is delivering to this country the people who will use them for the corresponding military and political purposes. This is another aspect of the relationship between philosophical abstraction and real politics which cannot but be familiar to our military and political leaders as well as our scholarly interpreters, who are prepared to explain everything and prove the unprovable as long as they can keep their cushy jobs in a country fanned by the icy winds of crisis.

It has become the rule for us that as soon as the discussion comes around to human rights we immediately refer to the "leading democracies" of Western Europe and the United States. I will not ignore fashion either. In 1990-1991 the United States and West European countries adopted laws on quotas, according to which the number of immigrants with the right to enter the country is limited. As we can see, the "leading democracies" will violate the abstract human rights for the sake of national and state interests. They are doing the right thing, because they do not want to generate more social and economic problems for their people. This is real humanism and a realistic correlation between abstraction and ordinary life. Our politicians will keep pushing straight ahead if only "human rights" are established in our country, and the whole world has seen that we are prepared for any deprivations and sacrifices for the sake of an abstraction.

Or another example. I recall that in the times of stagnation they tried to take money for education from people leaving the USSR. There was no philosophical loftiness. It was crude reality. What a worldwide uproar was raised over this encroachment on human rights and freedom of the individual! The decision was quickly revoked even though it made a great deal of governmental and economic sense. And yet in Israel to this day they collect approximately $7,000 to apply to state expenditures for social support for the time the departing people have spent in that country. And nobody dares mention the human rights encroached upon here because there is a great rationale for this "encroachment."

After all that has been said about human rights and laws, it is right for our country as well to raise the question of quotas for people departing the USSR, including to Israel. Just as is done in countries of "leading democracy." No more and no less.

But there is another explanation for the emigration from the USSR. The country is in a condition of general crisis, and this is what influences the scale of emigration from the Soviet Union (and Zionist propaganda—legalized and active—comes only later). Were it not for the crisis there would not be such an outflow of people who were born and grew up on Soviet land, who have received a great deal from it and given a great deal to it. Therefore, regardless of what political decisions may be made and regardless of what quotas may be established, the solution to the problem of emigration will come when the country emerges from its crisis.

But since emigration from the USSR is justified by universal human values, I shall address them. A person is not cannon fodder, not a market commodity, and not an object of political speculation. He is the heir to his ancestral and natural historical, spiritual, and cultural traditions. He is bound to the land by the graves of his ancestors who gave him life. Breaking these ties is as painful as a personal tragedy; can one speculate on this wealth of the internal human world, can one deprive a person of the fullness of his being simply to realize the mythological idea of reunion with his "historic homeland"? How can a philosophical abstraction about human rights be used to drag a person out of the cultural and historical environment that is natural to him? And who will be responsible for the life dramas of people who end up as unnecessary or as cannon fodder in their "historic homeland"?

After meetings, conversations, scholarly discussions, and friendly arguments with the Palestinians, I would sit in

the evenings in the hotel and look at the dull provincial programs on Israeli television. There was something so forced in them, as if we were back in the times of stagnation when "historical optimism" was mandatory for each member of the "new historic community of people" in my country. Right to the point where it was like the sports commentators who developed and fanned enthusiasm at a time when the game itself was so bad as to cause yawning and boredom. And suddenly bursting out of the midst of all this "optimism" and "joy" was an interview with Soviet Jews who were ready to depart for Israel. Their words contained so much hope and faith in the happiness waiting for them in the "Promised Land"! But how they misunderstood what was awaiting them and what an escapade they were being drawn into!

Palestinian Ambassador on Near East Settlement

PM0406120591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Interview with Nabil 'Amr, Palestinian ambassador to the USSR, by V. Lashkul; date and place of interview not stated; first paragraph is introduction: "What Is the Way Out of the Near East Impasse? Opinion of Ambassador of State of Palestine"]

[Text] The war in the Persian Gulf has as it were screened and pushed into the background for a while one of the most painful problems of the present time—the Palestinian problem. The question of its settlement has again come onto the agenda since Iraq's defeat. What role can the United Nations play in unblocking the Arab-Israeli conflict? We talk about this with Nabil 'Amr, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the State of Palestine to the USSR.

[Nabil 'Amr] Since the end of the war in the Persian Gulf it has become obvious that the most realistic way out of conflict situations should be sought on the paths of peace. On that plane the United Nations, which has played an important part in eliminating many seats of tension, could be of considerable benefit also in resolving the Palestinian problem. But Israel is doing everything to oppose its participation in this. He will not accept UN participation in a settlement in the Near East in any form whatever. And that is not the only obstacle which Tel Aviv is creating on the path toward peace in the region.

For several years now the PLO has suggested using the principle of "territory in exchange for peace." This slogan formed the basis of our peace proposals approved at the Palestine National Council session in Algiers in 1988. The U.S. Administration agreed with the "territory in exchange for peace" principle, as President G. Bush stated in his speech to U.S. Congress not long before the end of the war in the Persian Gulf. It has no underground rocks, and that is obvious to the whole world. Nonetheless Israel rejects the peace initiatives we propose.

Recently the PLO took one more constructive step by agreeing to hold a peace conference on the Near East under the cochairmanship of the USSR and the United States and on the basis of the relevant UN resolutions. We are in favor of it being given every opportunity to build up efforts to establish peace. This conference could be continuous or could be convened for routine regular sessions, but it should not restrict its work solely to a "ceremonial" assembly, as Israel is insisting.

And one more circumstance is delaying the onset of peace in the region. Tel Aviv refuses to conduct talks with the independent Palestinian delegation formed by the PLO. Yet our people's national movement has developed at all stages under the PLO flag. It was that which ensured its status as the Palestinians' sole legal representative, which was recognized initially by all Arab countries and then by over 100 other states. Now the cooperation of the world community at the level of governments and public and state organizations is implemented directly with the PLO, since it has its own parliament, constitution, and basic institutions which manage all the Palestinians' affairs. This status was crowned by its admission to the United Nations as an observer. In addition the PLO is a full member of international organizations like the Islamic Conference Organization, the Nonaligned Movement, and the Arab League.

Commentary on 'Doubt' of Mideast Peace Agreement

LD0406035991 Moscow Radio Moscow in Arabic 1400 GMT 3 Jun 91

[Commentary by Aleksandr Pogodin]

[Text] (One comes across), in evaluating the situation in this area from time to time, reserved optimism which is transformed into pessimism—thus, during the last month, praise and (doubt) about the statements by U.S. President George Bush concerning the scaling down of deliveries of all types of weapons to the Middle East, including weapons of mass destruction (and) conventional weapons.

These proposals resemble the ideas that Moscow had raised previously. Soviet-American contacts have allowed the narrowing of differences on the stand toward the Arab-Israeli conflict. And today, there are many points of agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States who agreed to chair the peace conference in the area.

But everyone knows, of course, that the Soviet Union and the United States cannot take the place of others in this issue. It is the job of the parties involved in the dispute. Here, differences have increased concerning the border issue and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment of their independent state. The stands also differ on the formula for the peace conference including the possibility of participation by the UN Organization and, also, on the form of the Palestinian representation in the talks.

Israeli stands give rise to fears. A short while ago, affirmations were made by Tel Aviv expressing readiness for peace and good-neighborliness with the Arabs. Statements were made, even though with some ambiguity, expressing agreement on convening a peace conference.

However the latest statements by Israeli politicians do not give rise to optimism. Foreign Minister David Levi affirmed the intention to hold talks with Arab states individually.

This is how the idea of the possibility of an Israeli-Jordanian summit is put forward. Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir this weekened once again announced most strongly that his country will never give up an inch of occupied Arab areas.

On what basis do the Israeli authorities intend to hold political dialogue on a settlement then? I see also some vagueness in some of the steps of the United States. U.S. Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney, who is visiting Israel now, announced a big increase in military aid to Israel. He explained that the U.S. Administration does not intend to scale down the deliveries of weapons in order to (press) a move toward political settlement. It is not clear how far this can relate to Bush's initiative.

Thus, there is enough reason to doubt if the new realistic opportunity for peace in the Middle East will be explored.

Deputy Defense Minister Departs for Syria

PM1605142791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 May 91 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Official Visit"]

[Text] Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, chief of the Main Military-Political Directorate of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister, left for Syria 14 May on an official visit at the invitation of Syria's Defense Ministry.

Delegation Meets Syrian Army Chief

LD1605103191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2008 GMT 15 May 91

[Text] Damascus, 15 May (TASS)—TASS correspondent Vadim Shchennikov: A delegation of Soviet political workers headed by Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, chief of the main military-political administration of the USSR Ministry of Defense and first deputy USSR minister of defense, met in Damascus today the Chief of General Staff of the Syrian Army, Hikmat Shihabi. In the course of their conversation, relations of friendship and cooperation between the two armies and ways of developing this further were discussed, the SANA agency reported.

The Soviet guests arrived in the Syrian capital on the previous day.

Returns To Moscow

PM2105151591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 May 91 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Return Home"]

[Text] A Soviet military delegation headed by Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, chief of the USSR Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate and USSR first deputy defense minister, returned home from Damascus 18 May.

During the official visit to Syria, which took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere, the delegation was received by Corps General M. Talas, Syrian defense minister, and Corps General H. al-Shihabi, chief of the Syrian Armed Forces General Staff.

During conversations with Division General J. al-Jahni, chief of the Syrian Armed Forces Political Directorate, there was a useful exchange of opinions on topical questions of political and educational work in the USSR and Syrian Armed Forces.

The guests familiarized themselves with Syrian servicemen's life and combat training and visited a number of units and military training establishments.

The delegation was greeted at the airport by Colonel General A.I. Ovchinnikov, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate.

Azerbaijan-Iran Hydraulic Project Begins

LD0406135791 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 4 Jun 91

[Text] The construction of a big hydraulic complex has begun on the border River Araks under an agreement between the governments of Soviet Azerbaijan and neighboring Iran. By joint efforts several power plants, high dams, and power transmission lines are to be built, along with two large water reservoirs there. These will be used to irrigate lands in Azerbaijan and Iran. The hydraulic project will cost one billion rubles.

Petrovskiy Receives Iranian Official

LD0406222391 Moscow TASS in English 2114 GMT 4 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy today met Iranian Foreign Ministry General Director Murtazo Bank.

They discussed international and regional problems, including a post-crisis settlement in the Gulf and prospects for developing Soviet-Iranian relations.

Iranian ambassador to the Soviet Union Nematollah Izadi attended the meeting.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Assessment of Rise and Fall of Mengistu Regime

91UF0803A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 28 May 91 p 3

[Article by Vladimir Mikhaylov under the rubric "Telling the Details": "A Regime in Death-Throes"]

[Text] **Experts in modern history had enough time to stick the label of the twilight of colonialism on the 1960's. They have not yet gotten to the late 1980's and early 1990's but I would like to suppose that they will become known as the "twilight of totalitarian regimes." Dictatorial regimes are collapsing and the nations that got rid of their "strong" rulers are trying, well or poorly, to start on the road to democracy. Today we are watching the downfall of the Ethiopian dictatorship.**

The latest news agency information leaves no doubt of it: The Ethiopian regime is in its death throes, rebels are besieging the capital, the country's President Mengistu Haile-Mariam fled to Zimbabwe.

When such situations occur, people who are not familiar with the country always ask three questions: Who? Against whom? What now? I will try to answer these questions in brief. Here we are...

REGIME: Ethiopia, one of the poorest nations in the world, existed with feudal relations and it even had some elements of a slave-owning system. It "matured" for an explosion after the horrible drought of 1973 when hundreds of thousands of people starved to death. Demonstrations and strikes could have hardly dethroned the emperor, of course, but the military interfered. Many of them had studied abroad and brought "seditionary" ideas back home with them. As a result, Haile Selassie I was overthrown and he ended his days in a jail.

As it usually happens in the countries of victorious revolutions, the parliament was dissolved, the enforcement of the Constitution was suspended and all power went to the Provisional Military Administrative Council. The future master of the country Mengistu Haile-Mariam at that time was a supply service officer and, naturally, could not grab the power then. But he wanted to, very much. However, he restrained himself and watched from outside the bloody vendetta waged by his potential rivals in their fight for the top position.

Both in those days and later, when he became president, Mengistu remained an enigma for his own people in more ways than one. Even his real birth date is unknown; state officials always referred to his official biography which quoted 1941 but before it was published 1937 and 1940 were mentioned also and knowledgeable French historians thought it was 1942. The same biography says that he was born in Addis Ababa to a sergeant and a peasant woman but some sources outside Ethiopia insist that his father was a cargo-carrier working for a landowner's family, who lived in the southern region of Kafa.

Judging by U.S. Department of Defense files, from November of 1964 through April of 1965 Mengistu Haile-Mariam studied in Savannah, Georgia, under the U.S. program for training the military from friendly countries (there is no word of it in his biography). In 1970, he came to the United States again and enrolled in the American artillery center and school in Aberdeen, Maryland.

In February of 1977, Mengistu came out the winner among his surviving but considerably weakened rivals and then he demonstrated his talent for intrigue and strategy. He was able to diminish the threat presented by the separatist guerrillas and by Somalia (with the help of the USSR and Cuban military). After he managed to alleviate the famine problems, he expressed his high appreciation of the USSR and its allies for the help rendered; at the same time he ignored all contributions made by the West. It goes without saying that his reward was quite expeditious: An agreement on friendship and cooperation between our country and Ethiopia was signed in November of 1978.

During Mengistu's entire rule the Western newspapers quoted eyewitnesses as they reported that the president personally participated from time to time in the executions of his political adversaries. It is hard to verify such accusations but one thing is undoubtedly true: Ethiopia has become a totalitarian state with a rigid regime, cruel treatment of dissidents, and total lack of any democratic institutions. However, the military successes of the rebels in the last couple of years proved to be so significant and the incompetence of the government army was so obvious (even in spite of the enlistment of 14-year-olds), that even the "iron Mengistu" had to change his tactics somewhat.

For starters he suggested that a new party be formed and the opposition participate in it. At the same time he excluded any possibility of establishing a multiparty system.

Then he announced some economic reforms that would have especially affected the villages. For the first time, the private sector was to become able to invest in agriculture and to be free to produce and sell the produce at will. But that was just a handsome gesture, unsupported by any action.

A similar gesture was displayed in March of last year. Here is a description of it made by an AFP correspondent: "The gigantic portraits of Marx, Engels, and Lenin have been removed from Revolution Square in the capital... The portraits, ironically labelled 'the trinity' here, were displayed in the square which in the old days was dedicated to the Orthodox celebration of baptism. Only the images of the Ethiopian leader are seen now in those places."

It could have been a kind of "revenge" on the Soviet Union which did not allow Addis Ababa to use Soviet planes to bomb the rebel areas. Our representatives

announced also that the military aid program which was expiring at the end of last year would not be extended.

But all these measures came at least a decade too late. As recently as a couple of weeks ago Mengistu at one time proposed a plan for negotiations, at another he announced an additional recruitment to the military in order to "finish off the bandits" and then, on 21 May—his 50th birthday—he fled the country.

REBELS: The oldest of the militant groups is the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF). Since the 1880's and until World War II this northern province was an Italian colony. Later it became part of the Ethiopian-Eritrean Federation but it lost its autonomy in 1962. For 30 years now the Front has been striving to conduct a regional referendum on the future of the province.

The Tigre People's Liberation Front (TPLF) defends the rights of another northern province which also used to be independent but later was included in Eritrea and then incorporated by Ethiopia. In 1989 the TPLF merged with the Ethiopian People's Democratic Movement into the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Forces (EPRDF).

The third force is the Oromo Liberation Front which strives to achieve autonomy for this major ethnic group.

According to the reports by Western correspondents, positions of the rebel groups coincide in many respects. First and foremost, they demand that every ethnic group be given the right to choose its own way of development independently, even if it leads to its secession from Ethiopia. They are fighting to overthrow the government, Mengistu Haile-Mariam primarily, and to establish democracy.

It has been said that the TPLF has a Marxist-Leninist core of representatives who are positioned to the left of the current leaders and who are trying to grab power under the disguise of a vast, populist movement. Even worse things are being said about the EPLF as, for instance, was done by a UPI correspondent: "The Eritrean functionaries often use historic determinism terms which could be quite appropriate in a Stalin speech of 40 years ago." However, a REUTER correspondent writes that since 1987 the Eritreans have stopped criticizing the "imperialism" in their program, they support the concepts of mixed economy, foreign investments, and a multiparty system in the future government. He quotes EPLF representative Girma Asmerom: "We have learned from the sad experience of other liberation movements. Look at China and the Soviet Union. Why should we go to democracy through a dictatorship?"

What is a realistic goal here and what is but a slogan? What is facing Ethiopia after the downfall of the current regime—a road to democracy or a bloody massacre sparked by ethnic feelings, revenge and fight for power? It is hard to make any predictions today. Time will tell...

SITUATION: The situation is almost clear at the front lines. But what is happening in the capital of Ethiopia is hard to figure out; the reports that reach us from there are most contradictory. On the one hand, there seems to be complete calm there; on the other hand the city is filled with armed people and there are constant rumors of future looting and violence. On the one hand, there is unrestrained joy, on the other—the leaders of "kebele" community associations which served as the government "eyes" are arming their members.

In March of this year Mengistu Haile-Mariam officially admitted the failure of the "Marxist experiment" in Ethiopia and ever since that time the group of the so-called "idle rich" was swelling fast. The people started to demonstrate their riches proudly. Most of these people are the children of traders, smugglers, wheeler-dealers and simply parasites who got rich by doing all kinds of favors for the government.

But they are not the only fat cats around here. When socialism "came" to Ethiopia, the heirs of the failed attempt made by fascist Italy to colonize the country had an opportunity to leave. Many of them used the opportunity but they returned soon after as they developed hope for the downfall of the "Marxist" regime. Now they are socializing freely again with the Addis Ababa nouveaux riches.

Well... While some people are waging a deadly battle trying to bring their nation up from the throes of poverty and totalitarianism, others enjoy fiddling while the city is burning. Some people only know hunger and poverty, others have all the whisky and cigarettes that they want. But everyone familiar with Ethiopia and its people agrees that the Ethiopians have a remarkable ability to come out as winners from every trial. For that reason, we can only hope that they will successfully stand the trial of the victory over dictatorship.

Commentary Views New Regime in Ethiopia

EA0206200691 Moscow International Service in Somali 1700 GMT 30 May 91

[Commentary by Vladimir Borisov]

[Text] The only result so far of the London talks, which has been mostly influenced by U.S. mediation, has been to hand over the rule of the country to the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front [EPRDF]. Herman Cohen, the U.S. assistant secretary of state for African affairs, pointed out that he was satisfied with the outcome of the two (?days) of talks in London. He naturally meant the promise of the EPRDF, the biggest of the Ethiopian fronts, to lead Ethiopia on the road to democracy, and that after a few months, a coalition transitional government would be formed. This is to be followed by free elections, which will result in the election of a parliament, which in turn will draft the country's new constitution.

It looks as if nobody had expected the situation in the country to turn out like this. Observers hope that up to a limit, guidance of the events in Ethiopia will save the country from the violence of coups staged by fronts. Although, unfortunately, a demonstration opposing the new regime, which is seen as dominated by Tigrayans, took place yesterday in Addis Ababa in which some people were killed, it can be said that the new regime is trying to maintain stability in the city and avoid any confrontation with the Amharas, the majority in the city.

In a commentary on Ethiopia, the newspaper IZVESTIYA, published in Moscow, said that this is a hopeful ending. It added, however, that the worst may be yet to come. The leaders of the Oromo Liberation Front have not disguised their displeasure at the results of the London talks. They are now saying that they will ask the Oromo population in a referendum this question: Shall we continue to be part of Ethiopia, or shall we secede?

A more serious matter is the Eritrean problem, which has been going on for 30 years. Isayas Afeworki, the leader of the Eritrean People's Liberation Front [EPLF], has already outlined the policy his organization will follow. The Eritreans are refusing to take part in the interim government that is going to be formed and they have announced that they will be forming their own separate administration. A statement from the organization pointing out that their action did not mean that secession is deeply doubted. When the talks about ways of conducting a referendum in Eritrea takes place in one month, it is possible that the regime in Addis Ababa may not hold talks with the EPLF, but rather, it may meet an Eritrean regime, which may insist on having an equal status. All these things indicate that the regime in Addis Ababa is already facing major political problems before it has even managed to put its feet on the ground, as the economy of the country is in ruins and starvation is spreading.

Meles Zenawi, the new leader of Ethiopia, who is 36 years old, is well known to be a tough person. However, many people now expect that he will abandon his ideology, which is modelled on Albania and Cuba. The West in general, and the Americans in particular, will not accept this. The new leader of Ethiopia, when faced with the choice of whether to take the road that will enable him to keep the unity of the country intact, will probably recognize that he faces the same situation that his predecessor, Mengistu Haile-Mariam, who fled the country, had faced.

More on Churkin Briefing on Ethiopia Situation

PM0406111491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Ready for Dialogue"]

[Text] The Soviet Union is prepared to maintain and develop dialogue with all politically active and influential forces in Ethiopia, on any topics. This was stated by V.I. Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, at a briefing in Moscow 3 June.

The diplomat stressed that the USSR has called repeatedly for an end to armed conflict in that African country. Now that a new chapter has opened in its history, the Soviet Union will continue to advocate peaceful, democratic reconstruction [pereustroystvo] in Ethiopia. Our country, V.I. Churkin noted, is "open to continuing cooperation with Ethiopia in those spheres and forms that will accord with both sides' interests, on the basis of equality and mutual benefit."

The Foreign Ministry spokesman also reported that a group of some 330 Soviet citizens who were in Ethiopia prior to the deterioration in the military-political situation have returned successfully to Moscow. As of today, 66 embassy and trade mission staffers remain in Addis Ababa, where they are continuing their work.

Soviet Citizens Evacuated From Ethiopia

OW0406082891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1530 GMT 3 Jun 91

[Text] The Soviet Foreign Ministry told IF's [INTERFAX's] Igor Porshev that a group of Soviet evacuees from Ethiopia had arrived in Moscow on June 2. According to the diplomat who requested anonymity, the group is 330 strong. After they were cleared for take-off, the Soviet plane took the shortcut from Addis Ababa to Aden on transport planes and the evacuees arrived in Moscow aboard the IL-86 air bus from Aden.

Asked about the situation in Ogaden where a large group of Soviet oilmen and geologists are working, the diplomat said that, according to available reports, the forces of the Ethiopian Popular Revolutionary Democratic Front have the situation under control. At present the Soviets are in the town of Diredava and out of danger, he said.

The diplomat also confirmed that executives at the Soviet representative offices in Ethiopia are maintaining "quite active" contacts with the former opposition leaders. In fact, this, according to him, largely determined the success of the evacuation.

South African Businessmen Seek Contacts

OW0406010891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 31 May 91

["Business Weekly"]

[Text] The director of the South Africa Fund in Germany, Mr Rudolf Gruber, who is also responsible for contacts with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union has held a meeting in Moscow with the president of the national association of leasees and entrepreneurs, Mr Ilya Baskin.

Mr Gruber said South African businessmen were in need of information about the Soivet Union and keen to open economic contacts with it.

Preliminary agreement was reached on holding a joint conference in Moscow in September or October. It is not ruled out that Soviet businessmen may pay a return visit to South Africa.

Set up in 1957, the South Africa Fund is designed to spread information about the country and to open contacts with the outside world. The Fund financed by its associated members has no links with political parties and is opposed to racism.

South African Businessmen Seek Contacts in Moscow

OW3005084391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] The director of the South Africa Fund in Germany, Mr. Rudolf Gruber, who is also responsible for contacts with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union has held a meeting in Moscow with the president of the National Association of Leasees and Entrepreneurs, Mr. Ilya Baskin.

Mr Gruber said South African businessmen were in need of information about the Soviet Union and keen to open economic contacts with it.

Preliminary agreement was reached on holding a joint conference in Moscow in September or October. A business cruise along the Volga River is also on the cards. It is not ruled out that Soviet businessmen may pay a return visit to South Africa.

Set up in 1957, the South Africa Fund is designed to spread information about the country and to open contacts with the outside world. The fund financed by its associated members has no links with political parties and is opposed to racism.

Gorbachev Greets New OAU Chair

LD0406193291 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT 4 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has sent a message of greetings to Nigerian President Ibrahim Babangida on the occasion of his election to the post of Chairman of the Organisation of African Unity.

"We highly assess the growing role of this Pan-African organisation in world affairs, in tackling urgent problems of socio-economic development of the continent," the message runs.

"The Soviet Union welcomes the efforts by African countries to settle inter-state and internal conflicts through political means, to promote the African economic community."

Soviet Vice President Meets Nigerian Minister

LD1605082691 Moscow TASS in English 1718 GMT 15 May 91

Moscow May 15 TASS—Soviet Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev today received Nuruddin Mohammed Imam, minister of mines, electricity and steel of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

The state of and prospects for trade and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Nigeria were considered during a friendly conversation.

Text of USSR Statement on Angola Settlement

PM0406120791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 91 Second Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "Soviet Government Statement"]

[Text] In Lisbon 31 May J.E. dos Santos, president of the People's Republic of Angola, and J. Savimbi, leader of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola opposition organization, signed agreements which are designed to put an end to the armed conflict in that country, which has lasted more than 15 years, and a cease-fire comes into effect at once.

As is known, this was preceded by difficult talks between the opposing sides through Portugal's mediation, with the participation of observers from the USSR and the United States, and with UN assistance.

The signing of the Lisbon agreements in the presence of high-ranking representatives of these countries and of prestigious international organizations consolidates the victory of reason and of the new political thinking over recourse to force in resolving disputes.

And so, peace has been restored in Angola. The process of the country's democratization is under way. The way has been opened up to national unity and creative labor for the good of the Angolan people. As a sincere friend of Angola, the Soviet Union welcomes this course of events.

However, the new path will not be easy. Ahead lie years of strenuous work to surmount the consequences of the destructive war, to demilitarize the country, to restore the people's peaceful life, and to prepare for and hold nationwide elections in the fall of 1992.

Paying tribute to the wisdom and political courage of the leaders of both Angolan sides at the negotiations stage, the Soviet Government urges them and all Angola's political forces to display high responsibility with a view to implementing the peace agreements and to strengthen mutual trust and constructive cooperation in the name of their people's highest interests.

For its part the Soviet Government intends to fulfill rigorously the accords reached in connection with the settlement in Angola, including in the sphere of ending arms deliveries to that country, on the understanding that all whom this concerns will do likewise. It urges

other states and the international community as a whole to give all possible assistance to the peace process in Angola.

The USSR Government expresses confidence that the success of the Angolan settlement will be an incentive for resolving by political means conflict situations in other countries and regions where they still exist and will serve the general improvement of the international climate.

Bessmertnykh Interviewed on Angola Settlement

LD0306132691 Moscow TASS in English 1302 GMT 3 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow, June 3 TASS—A settlement in Angola will positively affect the situation in southern Africa, including in Mozambique, Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said.

Bessmertnykh was speaking about the importance of the signing in Lisbon on May 31 of a package of documents on a settlement in Angola.

The Soviet Union and the United States acted as observers during talks between the Angolan Government and the UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] group. Portugal mediated during the talks.

Speaking about the results of his talks in Lisbon, particularly with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, Bessmertnykh told correspondents that an Angolan settlement proves that "Soviet-U.S. cooperation is productive."

The cooperation aims to add and guarantee decisions taken by the United Nations and other international organisations, rather than replace them, and to ensure that the talks continue.

Speaking about talks with the U.S. side on conventional arms, Bessmertnykh noted that the sides had agreed to "remove the massive stone from the road of our relations with the United States and Europe." Bessmertnykh said the sides have to elaborate some technical details.

Now, the sides are planning to "focus on strategic offensive weapons." If there is progress at these talks, the minister said a Soviet-U.S. summit is possible this summer.

"The fact that we have agreed to interact closely on strategic weapons shows that the U.S. political leadership also understands the need to resolve the issue, extremely important for the United States and the Soviet Union and for strategic stability in the world," Bessmertnykh said.

The minister denied reports in the West that the Soviet Union is wishing to attend the G-7 summit to receive financial aid. "The thing in question is that our concept is far broader and deep- going," he said.

He said the Soviet Union, at this important stage of economic reforms, considers it natural to cooperate with "leading economic centres." "We want the economic centres to understand what is underway in the Soviet Union," Bessmertnykh said.

"We also want to offer to leading economic centres a series of interesting joint projects, which could promote our cooperation in spheres profitable both for us and for them," Bessmertnykh said.

Yanayev Receives Zimbabwean Vice President

LD1805094791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 16 May 91

[Text] Today USSR Vice President Yanayev received Nkomo, vice president of the Republic of Zimbabwe, who is on a brief visit to the USSR, and who handed a personal message from President Mugabe which is addressed to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. An exchange of opinions took place on a number of topical international problems, as well as certain matters of bilateral cooperation. [video shows Nkomo-Yanayev sitting plus entourages smiling and talking to one another across a table]

Falin Meets Zimbabwe Vice President Nkomo

PM1705105391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] V.M. Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met Zimbabwean Vice President J. Nkomo, vice president and second secretary of the Zimbabwe African National Union—Patriotic Front [ZANU-PF], at the CPSU Central Committee 16 May. In the course of a friendly exchange of opinions they discussed the prospects of developing ties between the CPSU and the ZANU-PF, along with a number of questions of cooperation and exchanges between the two countries.

M. Sibanda, Zimbabwean ambassador to the USSR, was present during the conversation.

Official on Maputo Embassy Staff Disappearances

PM0306131591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 May 91 Union Edition p 7

[Letter from V. Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration: "USSR Foreign Ministry—on Incident in Maputo"—IZVESTIYA headline; last paragraph is IZVESTIYA comment]

[Text] In the spirit of frankness which distinguishes our relations with IZVESTIYA I must say that we were unpleasantly surprised by the note by S. Aleksandrov published in the newspaper 28 May on an extraordinary incident which occurred in the Soviet Embassy in Maputo. On 17 May the office manageress, an embassy

typist, and a trade mission typist left the city and did not return. Our reaction to the note is caused not by the fact that the subject found its way into the press but by what is in our view the frivolous attitude displayed toward it and the blatant inaccuracies.

About the thrust of the matter. We see our task now in shedding light on the real circumstances of the affair. Before that we consider it our duty to proceed from the "presumption of innocence." We suppose that journalistic ethics also demanded this from the note's author who was too ready to juggle with the words "ran away" and "vanished." For us the main thing now is to be sure that the incident is not the result of some violent actions. According to the information we have received, the young women are in Johannesburg. Our representatives in the RSA have been instructed to take up the question via that country's foreign ministry.

Now about the inaccuracies. The above-mentioned staffers were by no means "forbidden to go out from the guarded Soviet compound onto the Maputo streets unescorted." And the claim that the office manageress "was obliged ex officio to be a high-class cypher clerk" is absolutely absurd to anyone who is even slightly familiar with the functioning of Soviet embassies. So that there is no question here of compromising any special state secrets.

[signed] V. Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration.

From the editorial office: The letter from the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration chief is the first official recognition of the incident in Maputo. We are grateful to V. Churkin for wanting to talk with IZVESTIYA about the subject in his own name since USSR Foreign Ministry officials refused to discuss openly and in sufficient detail with IZVESTIYA the details of the extraordinary incident involving the three women. As for the inaccuracies, as soon as the USSR Foreign Ministry has full information about the incident, IZVESTIYA will be ready to publish it.

CPSU Delegation Leaves for Uganda 17 May

PM2005125191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 91 Second Edition p 7

[Unattributed report: "CPSU Delegation Departs"]

[Text] At the invitation of the National Resistance Movement of Uganda, a CPSU delegation headed by G.Ch. Shirshin, CPSU Central Committee member and first secretary of Tuva Republic Party Committee, departed Moscow for Kampala 17 May.

East Europe

Article on Army Measures in Yugoslavia

91UF0746A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent Ye. Vostrukhov: "Yugoslavia: The Army Is Warning"]

[Text] Belgrade—The bloody events in Split, where for several hours tens of thousands of demonstrators lay siege to the building of the military district command, attacked patrols and on-duty armored personnel carriers, smashed military equipment, and killed with shots from a submachine gun one serviceman and wounded another, have evoked a varying response in Yugoslavia.

Many people in Croatia approved of the "uprising against the Army." The following day demonstrations and protest meetings against the military's interference in the republics' internal affairs were staged not only in Croatia but in neighboring Bosnia and Hercegovina also. Near the township of Listica over 1,000 local inhabitants blocked the road along which an armored column from the City of Mostar was moving with trucks and dump trucks. Last night there was an exchange of fire between the Croatian police and the military on the Trebinje-Dubrovnik road. The night fighting ended without casualties.

And in Belgrade a special session of the Presidium of the SFRY, convened at the initiative of the Federal Secretariat for National Defense, most forcefully condemned the provocations against the Yugoslav People's Army, the attacks on military installations in Split and the slaying and wounding of the servicemen. The Presidium warned of the danger entailed in a policy of escalating clashes with the People's Army and charged the pertinent republic and military authorities to immediately conduct an investigation into the causes of the slaying and wounding of the servicemen in Split and to take all measures provided by the law against the guilty parties.

In the course of the meeting the federal secretary for national defense, Gen of the Army V. Kadijevic, conveyed on behalf of the Armed Forces Supreme Command Staff to B. Jovic, chairman of the SFRY Presidium, conclusions and specific proposals in connection with the continued deterioration of the situation in the country. This is the essence of it.

Inasmuch as the federation Presidium and other federal authorities failed in March to support the assessment of the situation and the proposal of the federal Secretariat for National Defense and the Supreme Command Staff, Yugoslav society is already in a state of civil war.

The operations with which the Army has attempted up to now to prevent interethnic clashes are no longer effective.

The Army will respond to any attack on servicemen and also on military installations according to all the rules, that is, with fire.

Proceeding from the Armed Forces' constitutional responsibility for the country's security, the Supreme Command Staff demands that all federal and republic authorities influencing the situation in society ensure peace and normal conditions for the solution of the Yugoslav crisis.

The Supreme Command Staff has ordered that the Yugoslav People's Army be brought to a state of combat readiness and undertake partial mobilization in order that the Army, if the leadership of the federation and the republics fail to ensure peace, may operate efficiently in accordance with its constitutional role and responsibility.

The presidents and chairmen of the presidiums of the republics, other than Tudjman, who had left on an unofficial visit to Britain (which once again, incidentally, reminded him of its desire to cooperate with a united Yugoslavia, not its individual territories), participated in the discussion of this document. The meeting concluded that far from all political possibilities had yet been used in surmounting the Yugoslav crisis. The intelligent, balanced actions of all participants in the negotiations, the renunciation of the use of force in all its manifestations and a readiness to compromise are now very important.

Peace and the prevention of civil war will not be achieved if people invested with trust continue to count on confrontation. In this connection the media are recalling Tudjman's speech in Trogir on the eve of the events in Split, in which he generally supported the demonstrations against the Army and spoke negatively about the Yugoslav People's Army leadership, accusing it of a dogmatic approach and of maintaining ties to Soviet generals and even of demanding assistance from the Soviet Union (in connection with this speech of Mr Tudjman's a spokesman of the Soviet Embassy in Yugoslavia told a correspondent of the newspaper BORBA that the two countries' cooperation along military lines was a part of Soviet- Yugoslav relations, which are built on the basis of equality without interference in one another's internal affairs. As far as the Yugoslav People's Army's appeal for assistance to the Soviet Union is concerned, the Soviet Embassy is simply unaware of such facts).

Many people in Yugoslavia are beginning to understand (and the statement of the Yugoslav People's Army Supreme Command has undoubtedly contributed to this) that it is essential to seek ways of prudent mutual accord. The country received with hope the 7 May meeting between Archbishop Kuharic of Zagreb and Patriarch Pavel, head of the Serbian Orthodox Church, who insistently requested of all Yugoslavs an end to the disputes and disagreements in the interests of peace and security and a solution of all problems righteously and in a spirit of Christian love.

...The Army meanwhile is giving a warning. The Army is waiting for an answer.

TASS Reports Pavlov To Visit SFRY

LD0406163391 Moscow TASS in English 1624 GMT 4 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov will arrive on a friendly visit to Belgrade on June 7 at the invitation of his Yugoslavian counterpart Ante Markovic, it was officially announced here.

Czech Ambassador Tours Yakut-Sakha ASSR

OW0506050191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 4 Jun 91

[Text] Czechoslovakia's Ambassador to the USSR, Rudolf Slansky, has made a tour of Yakutia, visiting a number of districts and holding talks with government officials and parliamentarians. The goal was to study the opportunities for promoting cooperation between Czechoslovakia and Yakut firms, specifically, for setting up joint ventures.

Deputies Paint Monument to Soviet Servicemen

LD1705213191 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Network in Russian at 1530 GMT on 17 May, fom the "Vremya" newcast, by correspondent S. Andreyev

[Editorial Report] The report is introduced by the announcer, who says: "A report from Prague, on a subject which, unfortunately, we are turning to not for the first time, on the latest incident at a monument to Soviet servicemen."

Andreyev then narrates over a video of the 16 May painting pink by CSFR federal assembly deputies of a T-34 tank memorial to soviet tank crews. The video shows people applauding the scene, and CSFR President Havel driving past slowly in a blue BMW car.

Andreyev continues: "I don't know whether Vaclav Havel turned up here by accident or on purpose; we did not see his reaction to what was going on. In general, there is a lot which is not known, and incomprehensible. For instance, it is unclear how legislators can break the law in this premeditated and blatant way. In this case, what talk can there be of political culture and democratic traditions? It is incomprehensible how it does not occur to people who have been called to care for their motherland that every such incident is a blow to the country's prestige, to its economy, and to trust in it.

The accompanying video shows posters in Czech around the base of the monument reading: "We demand categorically that the tank be removed!" "We won't surrender David!" "Vlasov" The plaque, in Czech, reading "...for the freedom and independence of our great Soviet country," has been graffittoed to read "...of their Soviet country."

Andreyev continues: "Production is contracting at many Czechslovakian enterprises. The warehouses are full to bursting with output. The Soviet market, the main export address over the past decades, is contracting with selerity. This year there will be more than a million unemployed. Now attempts are being undertaken on the part of the governments of both our countries to somehow diminish the difficulties of the interim period, and to build new, benevolent relations. I think that the recent visit by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin was successful in this regard.

"But, you see, someone is very displeased by the circumstance that the great eastern neighbor is losing the characteristics of a totalitarian monster in people's eyes, and that people are realizing more and more that we have to live and work together for a long time."

The report ends with video shots of street scenes; pink carnations on the nose of the pink T-34 tank.

Military Expert on East-West Military Ties

AU0406115091 Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG in German 3 Jun 91 p 8

[Article by Batenin: "A Chance for a Nuclear-Free Zone"]

[Text] With the Warsaw Pact disbanding itself, a unique chance has been created in Europe to implement the idea of a nuclear weapons-free zone in the center of the continent.

The "Palme Commission" was the first to develop such a plan in 1982, which envisioned creating a corridor free of theater nuclear weapons about 150 kilometers wide on either side of the dividing line between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

The Plan of the Corridor Was Unacceptable to NATO [subhead]

At the time, the East and West reacted differently to the initiative. It was unacceptable to NATO because it ran counter to the "strategy of flexible response," which was based on the means of defense from forward-based positions including nuclear weapons. The USSR, holding the nuclear weapons potential within the Warsaw Pact, basically backed the initiative but wanted the corridor to be expanded to 250-300 kilometers. The initiative failed at the time because the confrontation between the blocs was too great.

The present political situation is an entirely different one. The CSCE process has proved its effectiveness. There is an agreement between 22 countries on the reduction of conventional weapons and forces; security and confidence-building measures have been developed, and the USSR's and NATO's military strategies have changed. A broad strip of nonaligned countries has appeared on the military map. The USSR's military presence is disappearing quickly. Soon, not a single Soviet soldier will be deployed outside the USSR's western border. In addition, the Warsaw Pact's nuclear weapons structure on the territories of Hungary, Poland, the CSFR, and in the five eastern laender of the FRG will cease to exist.

In this way a strange "military-strategic vacuum" is emerging in the center of Europe before our eyes. What type of security structures will fill this vacuum? This is a problem which should interest all of Europe, which is going through transition from cold war to new forms of security in the area from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The Alliance in the System of Collective Security

The Soviet Union is closely watching the possibility of the Eastern European countries orienting themselves toward NATO. In view of the strategy of the NATO bloc, which continues to be marked by a Western European ego-centrism enhanced by the U.S. military presence, the USSR should consider such a development as an increased military danger to itself.

On the other hand, however, the new global threats to peace (such as the Persian Gulf) require the creation of an effective, highly organized, quick reaction military instrument within a collective security system. It would not be wise in Europe to give up NATO as a basis for such an instrument. However, at least three conditions should be met:

—NATO's structural integration into the CSCE process with the goal of a geostrategic transformation of the bloc, and the inclusion of the USSR and the Eastern European countries in its political and military organs.

—The practical change of NATO's concept and its opening to the East with the goal of giving all European countries from the Atlantic to the Urals equal security guarantees.

—The abolition of military doctrines and strategies that proceed from the military-political split of the continent and are marked by the spirit of cold war.

It should be noted that the fulfillment of these conditions (in particular the third one) requires NATO to carry out a number of changes (structure, quantity, deployment, military technology). Essentially, it would be a new military organization that would be based on the existing infrastructure.

Proposal for a Transition Period

Building a "pan-European" defense and security system within the scope of the CSCE will take much time. The transition period will be accompanied by instability in

Eastern Europe, and the old NATO including its traditional strategies will continue to exist for some time. It would therefore be extremely important that the new Eastern European buffer zone not be affected. I am talking in particular about Hungary, the CSFR, and Poland.

The national military forces of these countries as such cannot represent a real danger to NATO or the USSR. However, there remains the problem of possible nuclear weapons. Stability during the transition period could be guaranteed best if NATO and the USSR were able to agree that the mentioned region should be considered a nuclear-free zone—even though such a procedure would not be entirely in line with the international practice regarding the setting up of nuclear free zones. As a rule, the countries concerned declare themselves "nuclear free," and the nuclear powers give their approval in the form of "negative guarantees."

We can consider the signing of the treaty on the definite Two plus Four arrangement on Germany a precedent. Two articles of the treaty (Article 3. 1. and Article 5. 3.) contain formulations on the basis of which the territory of the former GDR can be considered a nuclear-free zone. The status of this zone is guaranteed by the fact that all the powers that have nuclear weapons in Europe have signed the treaty. In addition, the sovereign Germany has assumed the following obligations: It renounces the production, possession, and control of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and it cannot admit nuclear weapons or delivery means for nuclear weapons on the territory of the former GDR.

Problems of Balance in Europe Can Be Solved

The Eastern European countries' orientation toward the West confronts these states with the question as to where their place should be in the network of the military-political forces on the continent. It is quite possible that their place will be on the side of NATO. However, in the transition period such a development would be apt to affect the strategic balance created in Europe between the USSR and NATO. Fixing a nuclear-free zone on the basis of international law—a zone that is basically created by the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Poland, the CSFR, Hungary, and eastern Germany—could be an important stabilizing factor. Such a nuclear-free "buffer" is necessary for Europe. History has given us a chance.

Paper Reports Honecker USSR Asylum Claim

PM0306160591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 91 p 1

[Report by S. Bartnikas and V. Tkachuk: "Honecker With Us..."]

[Text] As reported by Radio Liberty, former GDR leader Erich Honecker has stated in a German television interview that the Soviet Union has granted him political asylum. It is known that Honecker has been in our country for over two months now.

We have been able to ascertain that the interview with Honecker was filmed last Saturday by Wolfgang Szusgien, the Moscow correspondent of the German television company ADN. "I did not know Honecker, and it was interesting to get acquainted with him," Wolfgang said. According to him, the USSR Defense Ministry arranged his meeting with the former GDR leader in one of its residencies in Sokolniki Park. During their conversation, which lasted quite some time, Honecker did indeed report that he would be remaining in the USSR, and there is official confirmation of this. He will live with his wife in Moscow, it appears. Honecker also protested the arrest of former GDR government head Stoph and former defense minister Kessler.

Unfortunately, we have been unable to ascertain how valid Honecker's USSR residence permits are. The Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies claims that it has not rendered him any assistance at all as a political emigre and has not petitioned the Soviet authorities on his behalf. The department for questions of citizenship and pardons has not heard anything about this either.

It is to be supposed that either Honecker made his own request to the nearest police station or resolved this problem on his own; or Wolfgang Szusgien has gotten something wrong...

Troop Withdrawal Rift Shifts Walesa Visit Plans

LD0306164191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 3 May 91

[Text] During the seventh round of Soviet-Polish talks in Moscow on the withdrawal of the northern group of forces from Poland, it has not been possible to make any progress. This was stated on the pages of the weekly SPOTKANIE, which is due out 5 June. It was stated by (?Jan Barysz), general director of the central planning office of the Polish republic and head of the group for resolving the property and financial problems of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland. The USSR, he said, intends to withdraw its troops from Poland no earlier than 30 December 1993. This is unacceptable to the Polish side. The current impasse in the Soviet-Polish talks is leading to a shift in the schedule for the Polish president's visit to the USSR, so writes the Polish weekly SPOTKANIE.

West Europe

Austrian Chancellor Meets Gorbachev Adviser

LD0306133191 Moscow TASS in English 1204 GMT 3 Jun 91

[By correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna June 3 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev's adviser Aleksandr Yakovlev, visiting Austria at the invitation of the ORF radio and TV company, met Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitzky in Vienna today.

The two discussed the situation in the Soviet Union. Yakovlev told Vranitzky about Soviet government efforts to implement reforms, saying that he was convinced that perestroyka was irreversible.

Vranitzky said he supports rendering effective support to the Soviet Union, primarily by expanding economic cooperation.

Both sides stressed the importance of improving bilateral relations.

German Environment Minister on Talks With Yazov

LD0306114891 Hamburg DPA in German 1051 GMT 3 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow (DPA)—According to Federal Environment Minister Klaus Toepfer, no Soviet nuclear or chemical weapons are stored on the territory of the former GDR. Soviet Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov assured him of this, Toepfer told journalists in Moscow today. The minister had travelled to the USSR to hold talks on environmental problems such as the repairing of damage done by the Soviet Army on its military sites in the former GDR.

Toepfer said the exchange of information between the German authorities and the Soviet troops would be improved in the future. Yazov is to issue an order to the Western Group of Soviet Forces to ensure "that cooperation with the German authorities will be improved." Until now, the German side has been allowed to inspect Soviet military sites to assess damage only two months before the withdrawal of the unit. Toepfer did not say by how much this period will be extended. The damage found at Soviet military sites has raised "great concern" on the German side.

FRG Sends Radioactivity Monitoring Equipment

PM2805095191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[RIA report from roundup of news agency reports: "German Experts in Chernobyl Accident Zone"]

[Text] An An-124 "Ruslan" military transport aviation aircraft arrived at Moscow's Sheremetyevo Airport 22 May. It delivered seven special trucks from Germany to the USSR for dosimetric and radiation monitoring measurements on territories which suffered radioactive contamination as a result of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station. The German experts will analyze the environment and food products in Bryansk, Kaluga, and Tula Oblast, and screen around 100,000 people for radionuclides in their bodies.

The decision to render this assistance was adopted by the FRG Government in November 1990. Seven million marks were appropriated for this purpose and used to build the special trucks equipped with sophisticated measuring instruments, RIA reports.

Soviet-German Troop Withdrawal Commission Meets

PM0306194491 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Jun 91 First Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Colonel V. Markushin: "Commission Session"]

[Text] As the Western Group of Forces press center has reported, the latest session of the Soviet-German commission formed on the basis of Article 25 of the Treaty on the Presence of Soviet Troops on FRG Territory and Their Systematic Withdrawal has been held in Berlin. In accordance with the alternating system, Ambassador V. Bertele chaired the session. The Soviet delegation was headed by Colongel General M. Burlakov, commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces.

The German side was briefed on the progress in the withdrawal of Soviet troops in the first five months of this year. The commission noted that the withdrawal is proceeding in accordance with the schedule agreed between the two sides. In all, over this period some 50,000 men have been withdrawn from the Western Group of Forces (30 percent of the plan for 1991), as well as some 12,500 items of various kinds of equipment and armaments. More than 260,000 tonnes of material and technical resources have also been withdrawn.

The commission examined problems relating to the handover to the Soviet side of deserters who are now in the FRG, and also to the safety of Soviet servicemen and members of their families.

Housing Contract Dispute With FRG Settled

91UF0797A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Article by I. Zhagel: "The Conflict Has Been Settled": "German Companies Will Take Part in Building Housing for Soviet Servicemen"]

[Text] **IZVESTIYA (1991, No. 114) has already reported that several weeks ago an open international auction was held, aimed at selecting companies to build the first four housing developments for Soviet servicemen returning from the territory of the former GDR.**

As is known, Germany has allocated 7.8 billion marks to this end; for this reason, German companies hoped to take an active part in implementing the agreement between the states. However, the results of the auction turned out to be not particularly gratifying for them, which caused certain tensions.

A special meeting of the administrative committee for the implementation of the agreement between the states

was held on 20 and 21 May in order to resolve the conflict situation. It was attended by a delegation from the German side headed by von Vuertzen, state secretary of the FRG Ministry of Economics, and representatives of the USSR Ministry of Defense, including First Deputy Minister K. Kochetov.

According to Deputy Minister of Foreign Economic Relations O. Davydov, who took part in the work of the committee, the meeting was businesslike and fruitful; both sides considered each other's problems sympathetically, and the decision made as a result of the talks is satisfactory to all.

Specifically, the results of the negotiations are as follows: The German company F. Holzman will participate in building a settlement in the area of the city of Vladikavkaz. Housing will be built in the vicinity of Krivoy Rog by the Austrian company Hofman and Makkulan, which will assign more than 60 percent of the entire volume of work to companies situated at present in the territory of the former GDR. In the vicinity of Shaykovka, a housing settlement will be built by the Finnish-Turkish consortium PEM.

As far as the fourth project, in the vicinity of the city of Borisov, is concerned, no common view was arrived at with regard to it for now. This is why a group of experts was instructed to prepare, within a very short period of time, a decision which will make it possible to immediately embark on the implementation of the project.

Summing up this small incident, we may say that both sides have proven themselves worthy of the friendly, businesslike relations that are now emerging between our countries. One more point: By now, the prequalifying selection has been completed of companies that will be allowed to take part in open auctions to build another 10 projects: five in Belorussia and five in the Ukraine. The auction will open on 1 June.

Girenko, Falin Receive FRG Politician Hornhues

PM0406154191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Jun 91 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Meetings at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] On 30 May and 1 June CPSU Central Committee Secretaries A.N. Girenko and V.M. Falin had talks with K.-H. Hornhues, deputy chairman of the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union faction in the FRG Bundestag, who was in the Soviet Union on a brief working visit. A wide range of topics of mutual interest was discussed.

FRG Minister Urges 'Favorable Terms' in East

PM1705111391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 May 91 Second Edition p 6

[Interview with FRG Economics Minister J. Moellemann by Ye. Grigoryev, PRAVDA correspondent in Bonn, and Jutta Falkner, deputy chief editor of the journal OST-WEST KOMMERZ; date and place unspecified: "In Favor of Deepening Ties"]

[Text] The FRG is the Soviet Union's main economic partner in the West, and the Soviet Union is Germany's main economic partner in the East. That is why the newspaper PRAVDA and the German journal OST-WEST KOMMERZ jointly asked FRG Economics Minister J. Moellemann to answer some questions. We now publish the answers which he gave to our Bonn correspondent Ye. Grigoryev and the journal's deputy chief editor Jutta Falkner.

[Interviewers] You were recently in Moscow, Minister, where you discussed future economic cooperation with the Soviet Union. What importance do you attach to FRG-Soviet economic relations, and how do you view the current state of those relations?

[Moellemann] Good economic relations will form the basis of the close political cooperation to which both sides aspire. Relations with the Soviet Union are of central significance for us. We also want to contribute to strengthening the reform process in the Soviet Union through constant, deepening cooperation in all spheres of the economy.

German-Soviet economic relations have solid foundations, long-standing traditions, and invariably good prospects of continued expansion and intensification. It will be possible to increase trade this year if the Soviet Union also makes use of the potential offered by enterprises in the five new federal laender.

[Interviewers] What is the federal government doing to maintain a high level of economic cooperation between our countries? To what extent will the credit provided by the federal government for Soviet orders at East German enterprises promote the development of trade relations after 1991?

[Moellemann] Giving cooperation real substance is primarily the task of enterprises and firms in the two countries concerned. Our governments must create the appropriate conditions for this. We have done so by broadly freeing firms' foreign economic activity from restrictions, placing an extensive range of consultations at their disposal, and underpinning the agreement on deliveries with export credit guarantees. The question of whether the special favorable terms offered by the federal government for deliveries from the new federal laender will be extended after 1991 has not yet been raised. It is important that these special terms be used by Soviet clients now; things have certainly not gone well in this respect so far.

[Interviewers] One of the first Soviet-German joint enterprises, Khomatek [name as published], is planning to build a trade and technology center in Moscow. What could be the importance, in your view, of this kind of

private initiative—mainly on the part of small and medium firms? Can joint enterprises count on government support?

[Moellemann] This kind of economic center—especially in view of the well-known shortage of premises for firms' representatives, and also for trade exhibitions by small and medium firms—is vitally necessary. In the past, unfortunately, many plans of this nature have not proved possible to implement.

The federal government supports joint enterprises by guaranteeing capital investments, i.e. by providing a state safety net if there is a certain degree of political risk.

[Interviewers] Minister, you are chairman of the German section of the FRG-USSR Economic Commission. What kind of role do you give to this institution in the process of implementing the Treaty on Economic Cooperation between our countries?

[Moellemann] The commission negotiates the aforementioned terms for trade and cooperation and discusses problems and ways to resolve them. In the 5 November 1990 treaty on the development of all-around cooperation in the economy, industry, science, and technology we agreed that the joint commission must continue to play an important role in drafting and implementing measures designed to broaden and improve cooperation.

Egon Bahr Meets Soviet German Representatives

LD2405031791 Moscow TASS in English 0939 GMT 23 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—Egon Bahr, a senior official of Germany's Social Democratic Party, met representatives of Soviet Germans at the TASS news agency headquarters in Moscow on Wednesday to discuss the creation of a German autonomous republic in the Soviet Union.

Several speakers demanded an immediate restoration of the autonomous republic in the Volga region.

Bahr supported those who favoured a stage-by-stage solution and denounced hasty actions.

He warned those who threatened of a mass exodus of Soviet Germans to Germany against "excessive illusions."

Population density is much higher in Germany that in the Soviet Union and it is a bitter fact but one cannot expect that Germany will eagerly accept all those leaving the Soviet Union, he said.

It is necessary to do everything possible to lay a basis for the restoration of German autonomy in the Soviet Union, he said.

Frolov Meets Mitsotakis, CP Leader During Visit

PM1705141191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondent Nikolay Miroshnik and TASS correspondent Igor Sysoyev: "Meetings in Greece"]

[Text] Athens, 16 May—I. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and editor in chief of PRAVDA, who is visiting here at the invitation of the Greek Journalists Union, was received today by Greek Prime Minister K. Mitsotakis.

During the conversation which took place in the Greek Government's official residence—the Maxim Palace—they discussed questions of further broadening bilateral ties, especially in the sphere of science and culture, in the light of K. Mitsotakis' forthcoming visit to our country. At the end of the conversation the head of the Greek Government asked that greetings and best wishes be conveyed to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev.

The same day I. Frolov met A. Papariga, general secretary of the Greek Communist Party Central Committee, and other party leaders and visited the Greek Communist newspaper RIZOSPASTIS editorial office.

During his stay in the Greek capital he also met and talked with Greek Foreign Minister A. Samaras; V. Polidhoras, deputy minister of the government presidium; and the leadership of the Greek Journalists' Union. PRAVDA's editor in chief visited the editorial offices of two of the country's major newspapers—TA NEA and ETHNOS, addressed young Greek journalists, and met the collective of Soviet foreign establishments in Greece.

Warship Completes Visit to Swedish Port

PM2005152591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 May 91 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "To Home Shores"]

[Text] Stockholm, 16 May—A small antisubmarine ship of the USSR Navy has left the port of Malmo City and set course for its home shores. The Soviet sailors' stay in this major business and cultural center in southern Sweden lasted four days and was called here a "visit of courtesy, friendship, and charm."

The crew had a packed program of meetings in Malmo. N. Uspenskiy, USSR ambassador to Sweden, and Military Attache Major General G. Demurin participated in the events that took place and also in a news conference held on board the ship.

The visit by the small antisubmarine ship of the USSR Navy will help to improve mutual understanding between our peoples and, in particular, between Soviet and Swedish servicemen, Jan Wikberg, chief of the Malmo naval region, pointed out.

Dzasokhov Considers Baltic Leaders 'Fascists'

LD3105184891 Stockholm Sveriges Radio Network in Swedish 1600 GMT 31 May 91

[Text] [Announcer] The conflict between the Baltics and Moscow, seen from Moscow's standpoint.

Sweden lacks the prerequisites to be able to judge properly what is taking place in the Baltics. The struggle against Moscow there is being led by people who are fascists, claims Aleksandr Dzasokhov, one of the new wave of ever more conservative communists in circles close to Mikhail Gorbachev. Right now he is on a visit to Stockholm. Krister Larsson reports:

[Larsson] Aleksandr Dzasokhov comes from the innermost circle around President Gorbachev. In the Soviet Union he has several platforms for his actions: as a member of the mighty Politburo, as chairman of a Supreme Soviet committee, and as secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. That makes him one of the more influential politicians in Moscow, and one of the hardliners in the new wave of ever more conservative communists. He is in Sweden now for four days, to teach himself and his country a little more about parliamentarism and democracy in practice. He is also seeking closer contacts between the parliaments in Moscow and Stockholm. this is what he says about the Baltics:

[Begin Dzasokhov recording in Russian, fading into Swedish translation] I knew while in Sweden I would encounter very great interest in the Baltics. This is a country with historial and geopolitical interests in the northeastern part of the Soviet Union. I also expect the same great interest to be shown in other northern regions, such as in trade and the economy, but this has not happened. [end recording]

[Larsson] He will not give the Baltics any special position with regard to other republics. He does not want to see any experimental workshop there, either regarding attempts to introduce a market economy, or in the matter of independence. That Sweden supports the Baltic republics' demands for independence is nevertheless not disturbing, Aleksandr Dzasokhov continued, but he has told his Swedish hosts that Sweden lacks real preconditions for judging the situation in the Baltics: Those who are leading the resistance against Moscow there are mainly fascists. When talking about the violent raids by the Black Berets, he replied evasively, but to the question whether there are forces who want by any means to sabotage the sensitive negotiations on independence for the Baltics, he replied:

[Begin Dzasokhov recording in Russian, fading into Swedish translation] If one sabotages the attempts by the Balts to break free immediately from the Soviet Union, that is not sabotage, but a struggle against anticonstitutional acts. [end recording]

[Larsson] That answer is probably exactly what the Black Berets want to hear. Regarding Sweden and the EC, he says that Sweden need not ask anyone's advice about its cooperation with the EC. The concept of neutrality had its greatest significance during the epoch of the cold war, and he expects that NATO, too, will now be transformed into something new, since the cold war has been put in the grave.

'North-East' Delegate Cited on Economy

PM0406085791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 May 91 Union Edition p 6

[Report by I. Zhagel: "We Cannot Remain Passive"]

[Text] Bologna—Our newspaper has already reported the viewpoint of Italian Foreign Minister G. de Michelis on the problem of rendering economic aid to the USSR voiced at the international symposium in Bologna. In particular he noted that in building new mutual relations in Europe and indeed throughout the world, no one can allow himself to run a risk by passively observing the Soviet Union's efforts to overcome the problems existing in the country. Too much will be at stake then.

This political statement was a reflection of the debates on economic questions which were held at the symposium. It must be said that the actual meeting in Bologna took place within the framework of the "North-East" association, which unites industrial, financial, and scientific circles of Northern Italy and other European countries and which has set itself the aim of expanding business and cultural ties with its Eastern neighbors. And by virtue of this fact the problems which exist in mutual relations between the two regions are a pretext for the association to make additional efforts and not to curtail contacts.

Actually, this benevolent attitude toward us is by no means grounds for embellishing reality. Thus, in assessing the present situation in the Soviet Union, J.-L. Kadye, deputy general director of the EC commission for foreign economic relations, unhesitatingly called it critical. In his opinion, the state budget deficit declared by the Soviet Government could feasibly increase several times over and be about 240 billion rubles by the end of the year. And the present increase in prices, which has struck the entire population such a painful blow, is only the start of the inflation spiral.

A special problem is the fact that in the USSR production is being curtailed in all the sectors which made it possible to earn hard currency. As J.-L. Kadye said, with the present development of events it is not out of the question that in 1993 the Soviet Union will be transformed from an exporter of oil into an importer.

No less alarming assessments were heard in the speech delivered by A. Volskiy, president of the USSR Science and Industry Union, who was invited to the meeting in Bologna. In particular he stated that the slump in our economy has not yet bottomed out and that the situation will deteriorate in the very near future. Nor did he agree with the Cabinet of Ministers' statements that by the end

of the fall the situation in the economy may stabilize. A. Volskiy said that this will not happen in less than 18 months.

But all the speakers stressed that the intensification of the economic crisis should only intensify the West's activeness in rendering aid to the USSR. Of course, this should be accompanied by a series of resolute steps inside the country and here, in the opinion of those taking part in the discussion, we cannot add anything new to the recommendations already voiced by IMF specialists, to wit: The decentralization and demonopolization of the economy, the further liberalization of prices, and the privatization of enterprises.

Nonetheless one fundamentally important thought was heard clearly at the meeting in Bologna: So far the world public's attention has been focused on the macroeconomic plane and processes are under way which ultimately determine the Soviet economy's transition to a qualitatively new state: It is a case of the formation of market structures like commercial banks and various exchanges, the growth of the cooperative movement and of the number of leased enterprises. That is why, while rightly demanding that the Soviet Union adopt laws as soon as possible on the destatization of property and antimonopoly normative actions, the Western governments, and primarily those of the seven most developed countries, should find the possibility to promote the further development of these new structures.

Italian Foreign Minister de Michelis produced interesting arguments for the expediency of this way of putting the question, arguing from the opposite position, as it were. Let us imagine, he said, that, disillusioned with the pace of transformations, the "seven" decide to bide their time with economic aid. That will be a signal for thousands and thousands of firms to curtail their relations with the Soviet Union. Thus, in dreaming of the success of perestroyka, we shall ourselves put an end to it.

Well, in summing up the results of the symposium in Bologna, de Michelis stressed that the meeting is among the very important initiatives which have been made recently in support of perestroyka in the USSR.